

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

No. 2.]

FEBRUARY 1, 1825.

[VOL. VII.]

RELIGIOUS.

For the Christian Spectator.

THE APOSTLES "AN EXAMPLE OF AFFLICTION AND PATIENCE" FOR THE IMITATION OF CHRISTIAN MINISTERS.

GENUINE christianity never appears more estimable, nor are its genius and tendency ever more conspicuous, than in seasons of affliction and suffering. It is then that its true nature is developed, and its firm support and unearthly consolations realized. If human life were one unbroken current of prosperity, if no storms of trouble ever disturbed its even flow, if its horizon were never curtained with the clouds of sorrow, it may be doubted whether the power and excellency of religion would ever be very clearly perceived or highly valued. If no occasion were presented to evince its supporting energy under the pressure of calamities, its power to mitigate their severity, and its tendency to give them a sanctifying influence on the soul, it could scarcely be expected to reach the common sensibilities or the common convictions of the human mind. Such occasions however, are sufficiently frequent.—"Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward." No character or condition is entirely exempt. The clearest skies are liable to be shrouded in gloom, and tempests may desolate the fairest scenes of nature. It is to beings thus obnoxious to suffering, that christianity offers its alleviations and supports. In the gospel the grand characteristics of piety are variously disclos-

ed, but are never presented in so attractive a light as when exhibited in the lives of those who have partaken most largely of its spirit. It is there seen, not in preventing the troubles of the present existence, but in diminishing their poignancy; not in removing its subjects beyond the reach of affliction, but in making it the means of promoting their increased meetness for a world where sorrow and suffering will be forever unknown.

The Apostles and early Christians stand forth illustrious examples of a religion thus blessed in its tendencies. In them may be seen a fair specimen of the energy of real piety in sustaining them in the midst of trials, and in giving it an elevation over all temporal evils. Under the influence of strong faith and its sister graces, they were able to view their deep and continued affliction as light and transient, and from past experience, confidently to expect as the result of present trials, future and eternal good.—They were able to close the enumeration of their difficulties and dangers, their perplexities and sorrows, in the following triumphant language:—"Our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory—while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen, are eternal."

A reference is here had to those trials which were peculiar to the Apostle and his associates in the

gospel ministry. They were not, indeed, free from others. They sustained the common relations of life, and possessed the passions and infirmities of our nature. Pain and sickness were their portion. They experienced the agonies occasioned by the disruption of earthly ties. Their tears moistened the graves of their companions in tribulation. They were borne down by the "body of sin and death." These they endured in common with other christians. But they suffered the greatest "trial of affliction," as ambassadors of Christ. A world was against them. Its power, its literature, and its prevailing maxims, were directly opposed to their every benevolent enterprise. Their aim was too lofty to suffer any compromise with existing religions however venerable and authoritative from age, or however strongly entrenched in the depraved affections of the human heart. It was no part of their commission to modify a few erroneous notions, or to alter merely the structure of prevailing religious systems, while the foundation was to remain undisturbed. Theirs was the mighty work to overthrow every system which did not rest on the "rock of ages." In accomplishing this grand design they went forth the heralds of the Cross.— Their preaching was not "in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth." Their theme was not the boasted schemes of philosophy, but "Christ crucified." Had their aim been less high, could they have preached themselves, and not a crucified Saviour;—had they like preachers of a later age, exhibited Christianity low in its demands, and conformable in its spirit to the temper of the world, the offence of the cross would not have existed. And the Apostles would not have had occasion to say that they bore "about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus." With perfect safety they might have added new dogmas

to existing faith, founded new schools of ethics, or suggested *improvements* in the popular religion. But when it was found that their object was not to improve, but to abolish, not to prune, but to cut down, not to change the bare circumstantialia of prevailing religious tenets, but to effect an entire revolution in the religious belief, practice, and feelings of mankind; when instead of amusing them "with enticing words of man's wisdom," they endeavoured to fasten conviction in their mind of personal impurity and peril; when with holy vehemence, they pressed upon the minds of their fellow sinners the paramount importance of a great moral change in the very elements of their nature; and in fervid appeals to the understanding and conscience, they urged them to exercise "repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ;" in short, when it was discovered that their business was with the heart, and conscience, immediately offence came, and with it the peculiar afflictions of the early champions in the cause of a spiritual christianity: immediately the malignity of the human heart was excited and arrayed against them. Hostility to the truth thus awakened in the breasts of individuals, and spreading through communities, reached the arm of civil power, and brought down upon the Apostles and their companions, its persecuting vengeance!

By reference to the history of the Apostles, it will be seen, that nearly every persecution they endured very obviously resulted from the plain and direct manner in which the peculiar truths of Christianity were presented to the minds of the hardened Jews and Gentiles. Because they were told the truth—truth infinitely interesting to them, they were offended. Because the faithful servants of Jesus could not disobey his directions, or "handle the word of God deceitfully," they were reviled, beaten, imprisoned,

and delivered unto death." These trials came upon them in the path of duty—not courted by evincing a "zeal without knowledge," by exhibiting truth in a manner needlessly offensive, or by using a plainness and point which the case did not require. They are afflictions which *they* experienced, who ever "spake the truth in love;" and who could declare to their fellow men, that they "sought not theirs, but them." Nor were these afflictions without circumstances of peculiar aggravation. The reader does not need that the emotions occasioned by abused kindness should be analyzed, in order to conceive how painful it must be to our common feelings, to have the purity of our motives questioned, our reputation assailed, and our benevolent aims and efforts opposed by those whose best good we have anxiously laboured to promote. Yet such were the circumstances which added poignancy to the affliction of the Apostles. They were virulently opposed by multitudes whose salvation they would gladly have secured by any sacrifices short of their own. In the ranks of their bitterest enemies, they beheld individuals whom they had fondly hoped to be the means of reconciling to God. To have their hopes blasted, to suffer reproach, imprisonment, and torture, however afflictive to our ordinary sensibilities, was less trying to them who had known the "terrors of the Lord," than the thought that any should thus madly venture to brave these terrors, and "count themselves unworthy everlasting life."

Opposition, however, from avowed enemies to the truth, was in the case of Paul and his associates, connected with another source of affliction scarcely less trying. To the catalogue of difficulties and dangers which they encountered, is added "perils among false brethren." Many, it is probable, had openly espoused Christianity, who had no cordial complacency in its self-de-

nying and humbling doctrines.—They had readily abandoned the gross impurities of paganism, or the dull and frigid formalities of the Jewish worship; but they remained strangers to the transforming power of the gospel. Their religion did not reach the heart. It was not so wrought into their moral nature, as to become a principle controuling the affections of the mind and the conduct of life. Having thus, no deep experience of the power and preciousness of christian truth, they were easily turned aside by the current of fashionable opinion, and felt little remorse even in "denying the Lord that bought them." It was from persons of this description, no doubt, that the pristine ambassadors of Christ, experienced no small share of their affliction. "Those who seemed to be somewhat in conference" afforded them no aid in their lofty enterprise. And even such as had been associated with them in the ministry of reconciliation, were afterwards found ranged among the impugnors of the truth!

Such, it is believed, was the nature of those singularly disheartening afflictions which the Apostles endured. In some respects they belonged to *their* office and *that* period of the Church. But the preachers of righteousness in subsequent ages have experienced trials of an essentially similar character. Their names are, indeed, forgotten by the world.—

"Few remember them. They liv'd unknown,
Till persecution dragged them into fame,
And chased them up to heaven."

If we examine the leading elements of their character, it will be seen that faith was the grand principle which sustained the Apostles amidst the pressure of their outward sufferings. It was this power to realize and appropriate invisible things, which at once mitigated the severity of present trials, and converted them into the means of pre-

paring them for future glory. They "looked not at things which are seen, but at things which are not seen"—which the eye of reason cannot discover, and which the grossness of sense cannot realize. For these unseen realities they had a high relish—these they made the great object of pursuit—from these they already derived a more substantial blessedness, than the walks of earth-born delights can ever yield. In proportion as their discoveries of these were enlarged, their attachment to the littleness and vanity of "things below," was diminished. From this sublime and holy communion with the great objects of faith, they could not without violence bring their minds down to the diminutive scenes and empty objects of time.

"The high-born soul
Disdains to rest her heaven-aspiring wing,
Beneath its native quarry."

Now strongly as is the human mind affected by those material scenes with which it is immediately encompassed; exquisitely alive as it is to the weight of present outward evils; and naturally inclined as it is to make temporal things occupy the entire limits of its vision, the divine principle of faith is sufficiently energetic in its sway to lift it above "earth and this diurnal scene," and to disengage it from the illusions, and to render it superior to the sufferings of sense. It was the direct and powerful influence of this principle which enabled Paul and his companions in tribulation, to regard their sufferings, although in their nature and continuance more than ordinarily severe, as light and momentary. Their minds instinctively reposed on the promises of God. When the powers of darkness were arrayed against them, here was their "high tower." Into this they could escape, and overlook present difficulties and perils. Here they could look beyond the storms which agitated the little scene around them,

and bend a tranquil eye on regions forever canopied with cloudless skies. What were reproaches, and tortures, and martyrdom, to men whose minds were thus fixed on invisible things, and even then anticipating "a most exceeding and eternal weight of glory?" What if they were reviled and persecuted by those for whose salvation they faithfully laboured—what if comparatively few yielded to the power of truth—what if its professed friends and defenders became the abettors of error, taking refuge in the promises of God, they could throw themselves into a coming period of the church, when a spiritual christianity shall triumph over the stubborn elements of our moral nature, and bring a world of rebels to the love and service of God their Redeemer. In this manner the faith of the Apostles tended to lessen the intensity of their varied afflictions. Had their views been confined to time, or had they been deprived of their confidence in Jehovah's promises, they must have sunk abandoned to despair amidst the persecutions which met them at every step of their career.

The operation of the same principle which so signally sustained the first heralds of the cross, must exert a similar influence on christian ministers in every age. The identical afflictions which befel the Apostles may not, indeed, come upon their successors in the gospel ministry; nor is it to be supposed that Christians of the present age will meet with precisely the same conflicts and perplexities, which the primitive disciples experienced; yet scripture as well as facts seem to indicate that those who will—who *must* preach the truth, will as certainly give offence; that those "who will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." And it is a most blessed truth that the same sustaining energy which could once diminish the weight and abridge the duration of the believer's afflic-

tion, has lost none of its efficacy in the lapse of time ; that while the offence of the cross continues, an eye to gaze on invisible realities is graciously afforded ; and that while "perils among false brethren" are yet to be encountered, "the shield of faith, the sword of the Spirit, and the helmet of salvation," are not taken away !

The faith and experience of the Apostles assured them that their temporal sufferings were preparing them for augmented measures of felicity in heaven. "Our light affliction which is but for a moment worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." They were conscious that while present suffering was wearing out and consuming their bodily energies, their spiritual faculties were acquiring new vigour. Their "outward man perished, but their inward man was renewed day by day." And is it to be supposed, if no calamities had attended them, they would ever have felt so lively an impression of things unseen ?—Had the storms of persecution beat upon them with less severity, would their apprehensions of the world of glory, have been so sustaining and cheering ? Would their spiritual skies have been so clear, had they never been scoured with the tempests of tribulation ? No ! Affliction never comes upon godly men unneeded, and rarely fails to exert a salutary influence. Their storms do not rise too soon, or sweep their skies in vain. "The trial of all their graces is much more precious than gold, though it be tried with fire, and will be found unto praise and honour, and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." It will invigorate and mature their holy affections, and enlarge their capacity for heavenly beatitudes. "Blessed is the man that endureth trial, for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life which the

Lord hath promised to them that love him."

In the example of the first preachers of the gospel, which has been adverted to in this paper, christian ministers have a pattern which they cannot too sedulously copy, and an encouragement to fidelity which they eminently need. Rarely have they been called upon to "endure hardness" under circumstances more directly hostile, not only to their own personal religion, but to the high interests of truth in this section of the christian church. The ambassadors of Christ need to be fully persuaded of the unspeakable value of those interests. It was this thorough persuasion of the reality and importance of gospel truth, which carried forward its first ministers in their benevolent labours. Had they been "double-minded" and perpetually vacillating between opposite opinions—had they doubted for a moment respecting the nature and worth of christian doctrines, the gospel in its purity would never have shed its soul-renewing light on these ends of the earth. If the same sacrifices and self-denial which the Apostles endured, are not demanded of christian ministers now, yet certainly the same sublime determination to do, or to suffer any thing to promote the truth as it is in Jesus, should be theirs. And let them remember, that whatever loss or suffering may come upon them in the judicious discharge of duty, will be rendered trifling by the prevalence of the principle which prompts to it. Affliction thus endured will be light and transient, unworthy to be compared with the good which faithfulness to their Master, may communicate to others—much less with the weight of blessedness which is laid up for those who fight the good fight and keep the faith.

J. C. G.

A SERMON.

Our sixth volume contains a Sermon by the late Dr. Strong of Hartford—the last he ever preached. The following was delivered on the morning of the same day; and is pervaded by the same tender and pious feeling which was so visible in the other.

Philippians, i. 23, 24.—For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh, is more needful for you.

It pleased Christ to make the Apostle Paul a principal instrument in building the church, and a most eminent example of Christian grace. The doctrines he preached were illustrated by his temper and practice; and beyond any other person, he instructs us what Christians might do, if their hearts were more warmed with love to the kingdom of God. Paul had the inspiration of the Spirit, assuring him what he ought to teach, which other Christians have no right to expect. This gave certainty to his words; but it was not this which produced the ardour of his heart, the unwearied diligence of his life, his zeal, his patience, and his triumph over the fear of death. These were fruits of the sanctifying Spirit, to which every Christian may aspire, and humbly pray God, and diligently strive, that he may excel in them.

The words of the text teach us the power of faith and love in raising Christians above the fear of death. A useful subject for meditation. When Paul wrote the text he was in prison, awaiting a trial, in uncertainty whether he should be set at liberty for a season, or speedily suffer as a martyr. On this subject he was writing to the Philippians. He tells them, "for me to live is Christ; and to die is gain." If my life is spared, I shall devote it to the great employment in which I have been engaged. If it pleaseth God that I suffer death, I have a humble assurance that it will be for

my personal gain, by giving me freedom from this body of sin, and admitting me to a more full enjoyment of the Saviour I love. In the succeeding verses, which are my text, he expresses himself still more triumphantly respecting death, mingled with such affection to the Philippian church, as evidences his fervent love to the kingdom and people of Christ. "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh, is more needful for you." We cannot find a more strong expression of Christian love. Such was his love of Christ, that death, which is the natural fear of all men, lost its terror, in his apprehension that by this means he might come to the Saviour's presence. At such a moment he doubtless felt, what he elsewhere expresses: "I can do all things," even meet death in the cruel shape of martyrdom, "through Christ strengthening me. O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?" Observe, also, the strong love to his Christian brethren, which is mingled with his love of Christ: "Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." The spirit which he felt was the conflict of love. Drawn to heaven by a desire of its holy communion, and drawn to earth that he might profit the souls of his militant brethren, and comfort them in a day of great affliction to the church.

Observe the reason why he was willing to live for a short season, and be detained from the presence of Christ. It was to perfect the souls of men, and to assist them by instruction and advice, in their own preparation for death. Mark well, my friends, the contrast between the temper of the world, on the subject of death, and the feelings of the Apostle, in whose heart the grace of God reigned. To them, death is the most painful object you can present; so that they are terrified

even by the thought, they must at sometime die. They consider it as the sum of all evil, separating them from the objects of their affection; and introducing them to a state and a presence they dread. To him, it appeared as the consummation of good, by delivering from sin, and from the world in which he found nothing satisfactory, and bringing him into that beloved presence, where he wished forever to dwell and offer praise.—Sinful men are willing, and desire to live here forever, that they may indulge the appetites of the flesh,—enjoy sensual pleasure, and hoard perishable riches. It is that they may keep themselves away from a holy God and his service. The apostle was willing, if it pleased God, to continue a little longer here; but wholly that he might be an example of renouncing and living above the world, and be an instrument of Christ in bringing sinners to repentance, and preparing them for the holy communion of the heavenly life.

In further discoursing on this subject, I will describe what it is that enables a Christian to triumph over death, and desire to depart. This is so contrary to nature, and what so rarely happens among the inhabitants of this sinful world, that it deserves the most serious inquiry; also, on what evidence it is that a person acting rationally becomes so certain it will be his gain to die, as will make him willing to depart, even under the most painful circumstances.—Faith and love are the two graces which raise a Christian above the fear of dying.

For this triumph over death, there must be an assured faith of the truth of the gospel.

I will mention a few principal things which produce the Christian's assured faith of the truth of the gospel.

1. The evidence with which the original revelation of grace was attended.

2. The display it makes of the moral glory and wisdom of God.

3. Its suitableness to deliver sinners from their guilt and misery.

4. The power of the gospel which he feels on his own heart.

I now speak of that faith which stands on internal evidence, for if a man be an Infidel, he cannot triumph over death.—That this gospel is the truth of God, the Christian hath every evidence that the nature of the thing admits. The gospel was revealed to men progressively, by successive and new discoveries of truth through many ages, in each of which there was an increase of knowledge concerning its origin, in the free and wonderful grace of God; the manner of redemption,—the glorious person by whom it is wrought,—the nature of the salvation given, and the manner in which it is applied to sinners. All these successive revelations of the grace of God harmonize; and at the time they were given were supported by the greatest possible evidence of their truth. They were evidenced by their harmony with the dictates of reason, and by the most stupendous miracles, and by such wonderful dispensations of a common providence towards the friends and enemies of the truth, as must be equally convincing to the considerate, as the miracles.

Another evidence which gives the Christian an assured faith of the truth of the gospel, is the glory of God's moral character, which it reveals to the knowledge of creatures beyond other means. All the works of God declare his glory, both the works of nature and of providence. In all of them every perfection of his infinite nature shines forth. But where do they shine as in the gospel? Here we see infinite justice which will not suffer the smallest sin to pass uncanceled or unpunished. Infinite truth, which forbids one jot or tittle of the precepts or penalties of his law to pass away. Infinite righteousness to weigh ev-

ery thought, word and action of creatures in the balance. The justice and the truth of God shine with a lustre in the gospel, beyond what could be seen in any other of his works. But these are not the brightest beams on which we look in the pages of redemption. It was goodness to appoint a perfect law, and institute a righteous government among the creatures he had made. But how much clearer the manifestations of goodness in redemption! An infinite Redeemer, pitying those who were justly condemned to eternal misery; extending his compassion to them against their own will; stepping into their place, and by his own sufferings bearing the curse in their stead, and purchasing for them heavenly glory, when by their temper and practice they were endeavouring to overturn his throne, and banish such a place as heaven from the universe. This is such a display of the nature and greatness of divine love as is found in no other of God's works. All the dignity of the Godhead, the sternness of his justice, and the ocean of his love are seen in union. Here we learn that pity and compassion to the guilty are not inconsistent with the righteousness of their Creator; and that revenge is a principle not admissible into the kingdom of God. Here the unchangeable holiness of God, and the stability of his law and government, are witnessed by the very fact of his forgiving the rebellious. Whatever reasons are held forth in the law against transgression and sin, there are much stronger in the gospel. This bright display of God's moral glory in the gospel is one ground of the Christian's assured faith in its truth.

Another evidence which gives him an assured faith of the truth of the gospel, is its perfect adaptedness to deliver sinners from all their wants and miseries.

When a scheme of doctrine and practice is presented for our accept-

ance, one of the first things by which we judge of its truth is its fitness to answer the purpose for which it is designed. This is a high evidence of the truth of the gospel. We have seen how it displays the glory of God, and the dignity of his government in forgiving transgression. How it shows him to be just in justifying the ungodly.

The gospel is equally suited to the wants of sinners. What does a sinner need to restore him to divine favour, and to blessedness? Is it forgiveness? Is it deliverance from condemnation to eternal death? Is it reconciliation between God and his own heart? Is it a righteousness perfect and spotless through which he may be accepted before his Judge?—Is it a perfect sanctification of his soul in all its powers and faculties? Is it an Almighty friend to bless him here; and a portion of God which will fill his heart through eternity?—All these the miserable sinner needs, and he may find them all in the gospel, freely offered to all who will receive them. Not a want, not a sorrow, not a stain of sin will remain when the gospel hath done its perfect work in the soul. This gives the Christian an assured faith of its truth. That must be true which so glorifies God, and spreads blessedness through his kingdom.

The power of the gospel on his own heart, is to a Christian the completing evidence of its truth.—He needs no other evidence for the most assured faith of its being both the power and the wisdom of God, for salvation unto all who believe. Whatever other evidence he may have, it is this which gives unshaken confidence that it is safe being in the hands of Christ, whether living or dying. This shows us why the unsanctified are so liable to doubts, not only concerning their own safety, but whether the gospel be real. The understanding may be deceived, reason may err, and they have no higher knowledge than

these can give. They do not feel themselves subjects of what the gospel promises to its friends. The Christian feels the gospel acting on all his intelligent powers and faculties. By its power he is become a new creature. His understanding sees what he never before conceived, the glory of God, his law, his kingdom, and all his works. His heart is become new. His affections have changed their objects. He hath new desires and purposes, aversions and delights, and from earthly, his conversation hath become heavenly. The Scriptures express the change more perfectly than it can ever be again: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new!" On these grounds the Christian hath an assured faith of the truth of the gospel; the evidence with which its doctrines were published to man; the astonishing display it makes of the glory of God, and the dignity and stability of his kingdom, its suitability to deliver sinners from all their miseries, and raise them to the most perfect blessedness of which they are capable; together with its power on his own soul, to enlighten, sanctify, and make him blessed.—This also is his evidence, not only of the truth of the gospel, but also that he is himself such a subject of it, *that to die will be his gain*. Beholding by faith this divine scheme of grace, and its promises, he feels a new, a holy, an unextinguishable, a glorious life kindling within him. He knows that it is wholly different from whatever is worldly and mortal, communicated from his great Redeemer, the fountain of life and love.

It was said that faith and love are the two graces by which a Christian is raised above the fear of death. The faith which has been described increases love into ardent exercise. Hence one description which we read of a true faith, is that it works by love, and faith and love acting

conjointly, purify the heart from sin. Love is the spirit of heaven, and the bond of union between all holy beings. It was love which brought Christ from heaven down to earth, that he might put himself in the place of guilty sinners, and by his death redeem them from eternal misery, and purify them to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. After his grace hath purified their hearts from sin and guilt, it is love which draws them up to him, that they may be with him where he is, and behold the glory the Father hath given him. Christ is the Christian's treasure, and where our treasure is, there the heart is also. While the world is men's treasure, they will choose to be in the world, and the thought of being parted from it by death will be dreadful. Love is stronger than death, and when the treasure is in heaven, its terrors will vanish.—What is there in death which ought to terrify a Christian? Yea, what is there that ought not to draw him with ardent desire to the change. It will deliver him from the pains and vanities of the world, which can in no other way be perfectly overcome—purify him from the sin which his soul loathes—and introduces him to the presence where he desires to adore and praise for ever.

The Christian triumphing over death, and desiring to depart, exhibits a phenomenon the ungodly cannot solve, for they never felt it, nor the cause by which it is produced. Unassisted reason cannot explain it, nor can philosophy fortify the soul against its terror. Where reason and philosophy fail, love and faith prevail, enabling the dying saint to say; *For me to die is gain; I have a desire to depart that I may be with Christ*. Ye who trust in any other defence against the fear of death, will find yourselves overwhelmed with awful apprehensions by the solemn event of its approach. Ye who believe, still feeling yourselves

partially under its bondage, pray for increase of faith and love : as these grow in strength, you will be enabled to tread the world under

your feet, and feel yourselves joyfully drawn into the presence of Christ your Redeemer and God.

AMEN.

MISCELLANEOUS.

For the Christian Spectator.

THOUGHTS ON THE RELATION OF MENTAL PHILOSOPHY TO THEOLOGY.

(Concluded from p. 33.)

METAPHYSICS no less than Theology, has, from some cause, been alarmed at the prospect of amalgamation. The operations of mind in religion, have been conceded by mental philosophers to theologians. They have assumed to themselves the humbler province of investigating the laws of mind in relation to the things of this lower world. They seem with many theologians to imagine that the soul, on the subject of religion, breathes an entirely new atmosphere, and has no longer any relation to the common laws of mind : or that the feelings and views in religion cease to be operations of mind and are unworthy of investigation. Why has been this divorce of religion, and the operations of mind in religion, from the common systems of metaphysics ? Are not the operations of mind on the subject of religion as really mental operations, and as really therefore within the province of metaphysical writers, as the actions of mind in memory or demonstration or volition ? And should not a man then, in honesty, who undertakes to place before the world a correct view of the *whole* operations of mind, to incorporate its movements on religious subjects as an essential part of his system ? And yet we may pass through almost the entire series of metaphysical writers, and wander amidst the ruins of demolished systems—the mouldering remains of

structures reared by the mightiest efforts of human intellect, now forsaken,—without finding a fragment that tells of heavenly origin, or that relates to the highest movements of mind in relation to God and the Redeemer. Does man cease to be an active agent when he converses with heaven ? Does mind lose its separate existence, and cease to exhibit the properties of mind when man returns to allegiance to his God ? Are repentance, and faith, and love, and hope, and joy in religion, less acts of intellect than when originating and ending in earth ? No one thing has done more to discredit religion in the eyes of young men aspiring after the honor of distinction in metaphysical science, than thus excluding the exercises of mind in religion from systems of mental science. The operations of mind in relation to the affairs of this life, are laid before the mind as the *whole* of mental *philosophy*, and religion is either removed entirely from any notice, or it is left to be inferred—an inference which is readily drawn—that our relation to God and the concerns of the soul have no claim upon our attention. A correct system of metaphysics would be itself a system of theology ; and if man ever arrives at the highest dignity of his nature, metaphysics will be the study of mind *in all its relations*. Religion will ennoble the study ; and a correct philosophy, be but the handmaid of a correct theology.

It is from this fact to which I have adverted, that religion has always appeared in the garb of a worldly philosophy. It is because in the instruction of the youthful mind they have been separated, and the one taught

independently of the other, that men in all ages have formed their theological opinions, by the rules of their philosophy. They are first imbued with the principles of mental science—of mental science without any relation to religion :—and the laws of mental science unimbued with any of the spirit of theology they bring with them to the investigation of the doctrines of religion. Hence Christianity soon after her birth put on the robes of Plato. Next she appeared in the *stays* of Aristotle : and was long, like the Alchymists, endeavoring to transmute the categories, and substantial forms, and dialectics of the schools, into theology. They were wrought into every thing else *but* religion, and Christianity soon became decked with the tinsel and gew-gaws of Paganism, and beheld herself at once the proprietor of the follies of the world. She has since been moulded, successively by the philosophy of Bacon, and Locke, and Des Cartes, and Reid :—and having adopted the principles and bold investigation of the modern philosophy, is now, in this country at least, undergoing a new change and tending to a new result. The probability, in one section of our country, is that having rejected the uncompromising investigation of facts, and the rigid induction of Bacon, and having adopted only that part of modern science which proclaims a spirit of fearless independence, and disregard to the opinions of antiquity, philosophy, contending “with moderation” for the name of Christianity, is putting on the open drapery and meretricious ornaments of infidelity and unbounded scepticism ; and will soon appear as the open champion of the principles of Bolingbroke and Hume. Yet the spirit of all bold investigation in this country is not tending to the same results. Boldness indeed, and fearless independence, mark every investigation in the eastern part, *at least*, of our country :—but it is boldness guided by different principles, and which will therefore lead to dif-

ferent results. The fearlessness of one class of theologians who claim the appellation of *liberal*—and who in some *undesirable* senses deserve it—is leading to a decisive abandonment of the whole system of revealed truth, and it is because *one* generation and not *two* have existed since these principles have operated in this country, that we have not seen this result. The boldness of another class of theologians, is exhibited in applying a philosophy long since gone by ; and in exhibiting an acuteness which would have done honor to any age, on subjects which better became the time of Scotus and Aquinas, than the nineteenth century. The acute distinctions and profound dialectics of a certain part of the Eastern clergy of our country, are but a remnant of the untiring subdivisions and puerilities of the schoolmen.—The doctrine which regards God as the efficient agent in iniquity, and which makes all virtue and vice to consist in exercises ; a doctrine which has originated from a peculiar opinion respecting the faculties of the mind ; and which by a feeble effort might be traced to a system no more modern than Spinoza. Whoever imbibes the principles of Brown’s philosophy, and founds upon it his theological opinions without any counteracting influence, will be a fatalist :—and though Brown may be the most acute of all metaphysicians, yet his opinions of suggestion, and of cause and effect, made the basis of theology, will either leave a man under the fate of the stoicks, or himself constituting an integral of infinite mind and infinite matter, with Spinoza. So intimate is the relation between philosophy and theology that a man cannot imbibe the principles of the one without suffering it to mould his opinions of the other :—nor can a man deliver the dogmas of the one without infringing upon the province of the other.

I do not wish to be understood in any of the preceding remarks as

pleading for the union of metaphysics with theology. The position which I would maintain is that from the peculiar relative connexion of the two sciences, from their professing to treat of the same subject though in different relations—and from the experience of the world, the one will *in fact*, give its impress to the other :—and theology *will* to a certain extent receive its modification from those who preside in the schools of philosophy. It is then a subject of immeasurable moment that the amount of this influence should be understood ; and since they *will* have a reciprocal influence, it is but common fairness if there be any true system of theology, that it should be allowed to give a form to the speculations of the schools. And while I would humbly pray that no bulwark—not even an outpost of Christianity, should ever be surrendered to philosophy, I would enquire whether there are not some things in our present form of theology as contained in our theological systems, equally at variance with sound philosophy and sound theology, which will prevent any considerable access to souls of the more intellectual part of mankind. There would be no probability of disgusting a man of the highest attainments in mental philosophy in referring him to the Bible as containing a correct system of Christianity. He would find there indeed much to condemn false philosophy—he would find many home-thrusts made at the metaphysics of Greece, but in the presentation of the plan of redemption, he would find nothing contrary to the principles of correct mental science. He would find no law of mind violated—none of its movements traced to erroneous principles. He would find many new developments of mind ;—many laws operating on a scale infinitely more magnificent than any thing which can be drawn from the schools :—and with the illiterate man might contemplate, with-

out any offence to the taste of either, these mighty movements of intellect. But Christianity is not learned by philosophic men from the Bible. It is collected by them from the pulpit, and from systems of theology. Indeed if we were asked by a mental philosopher—or by any other man—an account of our religious belief, it would not be the *most obvious* course to refer him to the Bible :—we should send him to a catechism or a creed, or to Turretin, or Calvin, or Ridgely, or Hopkins. The *form* in which Christianity appears in these systems is not the form in which it appears in the scriptures—as *embodied fact*, or simple narrative ;—but it appears in the technicalities of an obsolete philosophy. It is not the flowing robe, fitted for untrammelled action ; but the tight jerkin and small clothes of the “olden time” when men thought and acted by rule ; and reduced every thing to the dialectics of the schools. From these schools we have received our forms of theology :—and though we have professedly abandoned their schemes of mental science, we clothe our divinity with its dark and unintelligible technicalities, and present it to the philosophic world as the religion of the Saviour. And it is no wonder that it excites disgust. It is unknown to the Bible. It is not the form in which religion appears as given by Heaven. Neither is it the form of sound philosophy. It is the form of philosophy long since gone by. It is a monster come up out of the dark ages, and which has *fastened* upon theology ; and has moulded its features and traced its lineaments, by its polluted fangs. But it is not my purpose to trace the influence of theological terms in producing the aversion of men of taste to religion, which has been so ably done by one of the master spirits of our age.* But there is another bearing which

* Foster.

the technicalities of theology have in producing a similar effect;—I mean their influence in perpetuating philosophical errors.

Any one who is acquainted with the progress of mental or physical science, knows the influence which terms of art have in giving form and substance to systems. The new nomenclature in chemistry has done more than any thing else to advance the investigation of matter:—and the *terms* which were originated by the authority of Aristotle, did more than all other things for two thousand years, to chain the world in the intellectual bondage of the schools. Plato, originated or employed a single word* which came along down through the middle ages in the midst of fog and cloud:—which cast a mist, almost the only one—over the works of Locke:—which deprived the most pious man of one age† of the belief of the material world, and the most impious man‡ of the succeeding age, of the belief of the existence of either matter or mind. Now our theological terms have grown directly out of the full operations of these systems:—and they exhibit very much of the spirit—the dark spirit which brooded over the Church when Aristotle was almost the sole monarch of the ecclesiastical and the literary world. They have originated entirely in the mode of reasoning which was fashionable three or four centuries since. They were then closely linked with their peculiar views of mental philosophy. They are fitted for the cumbersome machinery, and untiring distinctions, and unmeaning subdivisions of the schools. They have no relation to the improvements of modern science. They now obviously suggest, to those who are in any measure acquainted with the philosophy of the dark ages, the modes of reasoning and utterance of the schoolmen:—and to those who are happily unac-

quainted with that philosophy, they are often a mere *substitute* for sense, and convey no distinct meaning. We have professedly abandoned the philosophy of the schools, but we have adopted the best method of perpetuating their errors. We have occupied our minds and our systems of divinity with terms which, as far as they convey any meaning, convey a meaning in coincidence with their philosophy:—terms which might be used in their own subtle modes of defending their opinions, but which can by no art be skilfully employed in the modern way of attack and defence. If the figure may be allowed, they came in before the invention of the gun-powder of science—they are the helmets, and greaves, and coats of mail, and pikes—or even the *catapultas* of the old mode of warfare:—but they are not the things in which to clothe a man against showers of grape or cannon balls. As far then as the clergy have any philosophy, arising from the study of their theological books, it will be the philosophy of the ages of darkness.—But whatever may be the influence of theological terms in our systems of Divinity in perpetuating philosophical errors, it is certain that a large portion of our clergy are lamentably unacquainted with the advances of mental science:—and it is certain also that they adhere with an unbending zeal to the technicalities of theology. Hence their sermons, and their books, and their conversation, abound with terms of an old philosophy which convey no idea, and with a certain amount of “cant phrases stereotyped” which are deemed essential to the reputation of orthodoxy. It is hoped that a large part of their ignorance of what has been done by Locke and Reid and Brown on subjects immediately connected with their profession, has been owing to the multiplied demands upon the time of the clergy; but there is not a doubt that a much larger portion

* Idea. † Berkely. ‡ Hume.

may be fairly ascribed to the influence of a philosophy which has been incorporated into their theology, and which is perpetuating not only the errors of theology, but also of a philosophy which had more of darkness in it than any other system which ever pervaded the earth.—This deserves the more particular regard, as the very men in our country, who are the most vociferous in their denunciations against the use of metaphysics in theology, are the very men who contend with the most strenuousness for the protection of every shred which fluttered in the breeze about Calvin, or every theological term which can boast an origin as venerated as Duns Scotus or Thomas Aquinas. It would be easy to adduce instances of what I refer to, but it is unnecessary. He who is familiar with the popular systems of theology in this land, and who knows their influence in forming the opinions of the clergy, can be at no loss for illustrations of the unhappy use of the half-civilized terms of scholastic Divinity. And it is a question which certainly demands the attention of the defenders of the truth, whether less tenacity in the defence of *terms*, might not conduce to the preservation of correct sacred knowledge, or at least to the removal of philosophical error.

If my purpose required it, it would be easy to reverse this picture, and to show the influence of peculiar terms in perpetuating *theological* errors. Nearly all the errors in the church that have the sanction of ages, may be traced to this source; and no better way of defending these errors has been devised, than by an indissoluble tie, binding a venerable term of antiquity and a heresy together, and making them the champions of each other.

There is another relation of theology to the science of mind of more direct importance than those which I have considered. It is the influence which a man's views of the opera-

tions of mind will have on the instructions of the pulpit and the application of the promises and threatenings of God to the heart. On this I can offer but a few remarks. It is obvious that this single relation will comprise the *whole* of a Pastor's public and private ministrations, or all that is practised in the labours of the ministry. To know how a text of scripture, or a doctrine of the bible may affect a soul under certain circumstances, it is necessary to know the operations of mind—to be acquainted with the laws of suggestion—with the train of thoughts which may be called into action, and with the movements of soul of vast and immeasurable moment, which may be produced by the application of a single word. A large part of the happiness of social life, and all that goes to make up genuine politeness, is founded upon this knowledge of the operations of mind, and the train of associations which will spontaneously follow a particular course of conduct or remark. And we are not insensible how much effort is required, to prevent, in the bosom of our friends a train of unpleasant associations;—nor how the finest intercourse of social life—of that which “sweetens and solders” the world, is owing to this studious effort to know the springs of action of those with whom we associate, or to touch that spring which shall produce a harmonious and delightful movement. If this world owe so much of its comfort to this effort to learn the souls of men, and to adapt ourselves to the laws of mind, how important does it become where our conduct and conversation is about to regulate the intercourse of another world; or when a single remark from the pulpit or in private, may suggest a train of thoughts which shall reach to the skies, and direct the movements of the soul for ever. And in view of this fact, how momentous is that office which thus professes to be ac-

quainted with the laws of mind ; and with the fitness of truth to comfort the mourner, to alarm and to awe the careless, and to point the humble Christian to the kindred spirits of the just—to the unending union of the blessed. There may be moments when the soul is passing from death unto life, where a single word may determine its final destiny : and there may be seasons in a time of religious excitement, when a whole province in hell may be peopled by a single speech. It is extremely easy to apply the truths of the bible in such a way that the soul may be deceived ; but it is not easy to know that state of soul when God's truth may be applied in such a way as to save the soul :—and I would humbly enquire whether in revivals of religion the assistance of the *aged* men of the ministry, should not oftener be resorted to, instead of committing their almost entire management to unfledged theologians, who may be even without authority to preach—ignorant of the laws of mind, and of theology :—of the train of consequences which may follow the work of a single hour, and whose only qualification for this work may be strength of lungs and muscle. The inference which I would draw from these remarks is, that it is a subject of immeasurable moment that theologians should be well acquainted with the laws of mind—with *correct* mental philosophy :—and that the pulpit “in its legitimate sober use,” while it should never teach metaphysics for divinity, should yet exhibit evidence of acquaintance with the laws which regulate human movements : with the principles which have regulated the divine mind in the government and redemption of the world, and with the principles which shall reign in the realms where philosophy shall be theology ;—and where the relations of created minds shall be lost in their relation with the greatest of all minds.

A. B.

For the Christian Spectator.

PERIODICAL CRITICISM.

FROM the new character, and great and increasing influence which Periodical Criticism has acquired in our own times, an investigation of its nature and genuine tendencies, whether for evil or for good, has become a subject of great and serious interest. But a philosophical investigation of this subject would require more time and talent than generally fall to the lot of an Essayist. I propose merely to make a few remarks on the general nature of criticism ; to point out some of its most obvious beneficial effects ; to vindicate it from some popular objections ; and to trace its connexion with the melioration of the present political situation of the world.

Criticism, which in the original and most comprehensive meaning of the word, has been defined to be “the act of judging and expressing our judgments on the excellences and defects of *any* object to which our attention may be directed,” is one of the earliest of intellectual exercises. For, so soon as the mind has acquired a competent knowledge of surrounding objects, it begins to form opinions or judgments of their intrinsic and relative defects, beauty, value, and capacity of giving pleasure or pain, or of being mischievous or beneficial. This propensity “grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength ; and the spirit of investigation discovers itself under different modifications in every individual, in every different state of society. But man is not only a critic in this broad sense of the term, on surrounding objects, and on his own thoughts and conclusions ; but these conclusions, the reasons on which they are founded, and incidentally, the language in which they are expressed, furnish, when *communicated* to other minds, materials for

reflection and criticism. And so much are our pleasures increased, and our griefs diminished by sympathy, and even by contradiction, that to form opinions and to communicate them, are almost one and the same thing. Accordingly, conversation is almost exclusively employed in investigations of truth, in the detection of falsehood, in lashing vice, or defending it, in *pitying imbecility*, in ridiculing empty assumption, in discussing opinions:—in other words in criticism. Every man has some characters, subjects, or opinions, that interest him more than others; but all minds unite in their obedience to that great law of nature, which commands them to judge, and impels them to impart their conclusions to others. Earth, sea, sky, air, man's nature, actions, hopes and duties, surrounding objects, and all that is great, and all that is minute in the universe, are subject to our contemplation and inquiry; and if their boundless riches are discovered, their nice relations and beautiful dependencies laid open, and distinctly seen, it arises from that spirit of inquiry which compels him to examine, and that love of discussion which leads him to avail himself of the experience and knowledge of others.

Suppose this strong propensity did not exist—no motive would remain for intellectual exertion—man would descend from the rank he occupies as a reasoning being, and become the creature of instinct. Mankind being ready to adopt any conclusion that might be thrust upon them without examination, would bow down before the despotism of genius—they would deserve masters, not teachers; and literature and its exalting influences could never even have had an existence. But the human mind is not so constituted: it will judge and pronounce its judgments; and the same propensity, which on the subjects of ordinary life, illumines the banquet of conversation with the sparkles of

wit, or seasons it with the pepper of satire, is often applied with the happiest success in exposing the bad principles, the bad taste, and the false conclusions of literary works. In the youth of society, when poetry was literature, and its only monuments the deep impressions it engraved on the memories of men, the poet needed and received no criticism but the starting tears of his enraptured auditory, and the mastered feelings which his song and his lyre swept triumphantly along. In a more advanced period, when men thought more and felt less, the oral criticism of the few that read, would furnish all the control over authors and their works, which the interests of literature required. But in our own times, when so many books are written, that “the world can hardly contain them,” it is necessary that criticism should assume a written form also; and as books laden with evil and stupidity are continually sent forth, criticism ought to be constantly on its guard like Raphael in Milton, to warn the public that evil and stupidity are approaching.

But a slight view of some of the evils it is calculated to prevent will show how useful Periodical Criticism may be.—A large proportion of the subjects on which books are written lie at a great distance from the ordinary business and pursuits of men, and do not generally interest them. There is danger, therefore that ignorance will prevail on many important subjects, unless some way be devised to kindle discussion, and excite curiosity towards them. Another difficulty is, that even good books on interesting subjects, are frequently voluminous, and contain much matter, not generally interesting. On the other hand, bad books are continually written and going into circulation in which the “worse” is made to appear the “better reason,” and poison is concealed under the forms of logic, or the flowers of art and

rhetoric. It is not a contradiction to the representation before given, of the strength and prevalence of the spirit of investigation, to say, that the unassisted many are unable without greater maturity of judgment, and more time and devotion to literary pursuits than they can be supposed to possess, to strip from the corrupting principles of such books the drapery of the enchanting eloquence by which they are surrounded. There are many books not intrinsically vicious, but whose circulation operates to debilitate the public mind, and unfit it for sober and useful investigation. Literary criticism is admirably calculated, from the circumstance of its being *periodical*, to set the literary world in motion when inert; and no form of literature can so effectually give a proper direction to literary curiosity when once excited. Every man can read a short article in a review, who would not have thought of reading the work criticised; and many would be excited to the perusal and study of the work, and even to an extended investigation of the subject of it, from barely reading the review. And, before criticism had acquired that firm foot-hold and wide influence which it possesses at present, there were many extraordinary instances of neglect of the noblest productions of human genius. Milton was not only obliged to sell his *Paradise Lost* for a trifle,—a sufficient reproach on the age whose glory as well ingratitude he has consecrated to immortality—but he had the mortification to see his work sink into oblivion; and in oblivion it remained till the critical papers of Addison, in the *Spectator*, awoke the attention of the world to its transcendent power and genius;—and then

Glory without end
Scattered the clouds away, and on his
name attend
The praises of all time.

Another happy effect of literary
VOL. VII.—No. 2.

10

criticism, is to hinder, if not to prevent, the multiplication of good-for-nothing books. And how many of them have issued and are daily issuing from the presses of England and America? It is not the complaint of Fisher Ames—it has been the complaint of two centuries, that “literary curiosity suffers oftener from repletion than from hunger.” If the food which gratified this craving appetite were the foundation of those great minds that have laboured in the vineyard of literature for the improvement and consolation of mankind, the celestial banquet would dispel the disorders of the mind; impart strength without intoxication, and stimulate the imagination without inflaming or corrupting it. But the works of the masters are expelled from the niches they ought to occupy in the public memory and attention, and replaced by works professing to teach science without study, by flippant books on theology, by poor poems, poorer plays, and still poorer and more despicable novels. These by thousands and ten thousands hover like crows over the field of literature, intercepting like clouds the light of a purer taste, choking like weeds every plant of a useful kind, as soon as it springs up in the public mind, disgusting men of sense, filling the heads of the unthinking with false and exaggerated ideas of human nature, and substituting a sickly sentimentality in the place of the hearty morality of a better age. How valuable then is *any* thing that strikes at these effects by preventing their cause. And criticism will do this, if any thing can,—at least, we have every reasonable security that criticism will do its duty in this behalf. For, it must be allowed that criticism sharpens the perception of faults: and none have ever accused it of a tendency to inspire that easy good nature which winks at, rather than exposes them. Against any such tendency there is a sufficient counterpoise in that love of superi-

ority, which is common to all minds, and which makes the detection of a fault or defect, the subject of more exquisite pleasure and self-gratulation than even the production of a splendid original beauty. Men view with great indifference the sun when in its full strength,

“On his wings
Of glory, up the east he springs;”

but crowd with eager impatience on the telescope which reveals the broad black spot on his disk, that deforms his surface and diminishes his splendour. If criticism fearlessly attacks the works of gigantic minds, would she forego the easy and secure castigation of snivelling imbecility—especially, if provoked by its success? Her history answers, no! The history of our own times answers, no! For it is but recently that Gifford breathed on Dedacrusca's air castles and they fell—it is but recently that criticism has exorcised Lewis's devils, hung up his monks and inquisitors in chains; and consigned his books to the common hangman; and these are indications that she will soon inflict the same penal vengeance on Lord Byron's pirates and murderers. We are not, however, speaking of the pernicious principles of perverted genius; but the suppression of contemptible and worthless books: and it is easy to imagine the grin, the remorseless chuckle of delight, which beamed from the face of the reviewer while dissecting Lady Morgan's last work on Italy—a delight unequalled by any thing save the pleasure of dissecting a good piece of English roast beef, by a hungry critic or a starving poet.—Folly then, nonsense, and stupidity, are the crimes of which the court of criticism have peculiar jurisdiction. If criticism cannot abate nuisances, it can, and it does diminish their influence, and limit their circulation by emptying the vessels of contempt and ridicule upon them. But in estimating the merits of literary criticism, it is necessary, not only

to recollect the droves of worthless books, whose tardy pace she has quickened into their native obscurity and oblivion; but also how many the fear of her gorgon face has prevented from being published. But for this how often should we be called to be dissolved by the eloquent strains of insignificant poetasters, whose harps, alas! now hang upon the willow! How many griefs and distresses of lovelorn damsels and immaculate heroes would be inflicted on us by novelists, who are at this moment engaged in some less perilous, though more humble employment. Instead of blaming criticism, as some have done, for the evils she could not prevent, let us thank her for the good she has actually done;—and in view of the vast crop of nonsense and absurdity constantly increasing, which remains to be extirpated and prevented—let us say with Irving, “be the growth of critics good, bad, and indifferent, encouraged by all means;”—and to the critics themselves, with Shakespeare,

“Lay on McDuff,
And ——— be he, who first cries hold,
enough.”

Another effect of criticism is to compel authors to write well and ably. The very existence of an able and independent body of censors, ready to detect, and willing to expose their “lame and impotent conclusions,” their negligence, false taste, and mistakes, will operate as a check on that indolence to which literary men are peculiarly prone, and keep the muscles of their minds in full tension. No author was ever more severely and perseveringly criticised than Pope; and although his irritable spirit has hung up his critics to the contempt of posterity in his *Dunciad*, yet to them, perhaps, more than to any other cause, was he indebted for the peculiar excellence of his writings and the permanent duration of his fame.—But while criticism exerts this salutary control over established au-

thors, does it not tend to repress the ardour of the young and inexperienced adventurer in the sea of literature? Never, I answer, except where the fear of disgrace is a stronger sentiment than the love of distinction—a temper of mind hardly consistent with intellectual superiority, and still more seldom found combined with the inexperience and fearless impetuosity of youth. But every man, whether young or old, whether inexperienced or not, is capable of making a correct—at least a *tolerably* correct—estimate of his powers. If that estimate should be humble, and public opinion should ratify it, and he should still resolve to embark on the troubled waters of literature, criticism will certainly quicken his diligence, and might lash him into respectability. But the real *genius*, with his consciousness of quicker perception, more comprehensive views, and greater intellectual wealth and strength than other men possess, and with the lofty hopes and ardent ambition which generally accompany such endowments, what effect can censure and opposition—whether minute or not—have on him, but to provoke him to more vigorous and persevering exertions; and such is the lesson that the history of literary contests reads to us, from that between Milton and Salmarius, to Jeffrey's attempt to strangle in his cradle the poetical Hercules of our own time. For, if there is any strong passion, it is the love of literary offspring; proportionably strong is the resentment of any real or imagined abuse of it. The same love of superiority that urges the critic to make the attack, will rouse the author to repel it. The irritated, not humbled spirit, pants to regain the estimation it feels the consciousness of deserving, and the ability to acquire; and good sense will finally suggest to him that it is not by angry invective, in which the public can feel no sympathy, that he can hope successfully to re-

pel it; but by correcting himself in those points where he is defective, and strengthening himself in those where he is strong. He knows besides, that genius by its own intrinsic energy can remove, or by its elasticity can bound over, every obstacle which unjust and malignant criticism can raise in its way.

Criticism can keep merit in the back ground but for a season, if merit is but true to itself: be it as unjust and malignant as authors are apt to describe it, it can do no *permanent* injury, even on the supposition that persevering cruelty and malignity employed in the depreciation of merit, would *not* call up candour and ability to its defence; a supposition unfounded in truth. Still it would be vain to deny that some there are even gifted with the finest talents: formed and fashioned by the hand of nature to extend the boundaries of thought and add new stars to the literary hemisphere, who are cursed with an exquisite sensibility; and that a morbid fear of criticism may have chilled the glow of composition, and in some instances have arrested it entirely. But even such may know that however critics may treat them, the world will at length do justice to them. Such a man was Kirke White; and although the rude reception of his first poetical essays gave him the keenest pain, yet he persevered; and what was the consequence? He enjoyed even before the extinction of his short life the triumphant consolation of seeing public opinion enrol his name on the catalogue of those “the world would not willingly let die.” But the whole amount of real talent which criticism withdraws from the service of literature is small; for how many, I ask, does modesty or diffidence in their own abilities restrain from rushing into notoriety at all hazards?

Another effect of criticism at which I can but just hint, is to *diffuse* a juster perception of the beau-

ties of composition ; and to open to the public mind a wide horizon of new and intellectual enjoyments :—an effect arising from the nature of this species of literature. Being published at short intervals, and embracing all topics, Reviews have the advantage of perpetual novelty and variety to recommend them to *general* attention and ensure them a wide circulation. And therefore they will be read where old and systematic works, confined to particular topics would be generally neglected. Suppose these reviews to be conducted with little ability they will be useful, inasmuch as even the little information they would communicate is better than the absence of it. But suppose them powerfully conducted, they would force thoughts upon the public mind ; they would propel the generality to further reading and reflection, if any thing can. But one effect—and the most important one—they certainly would have, to keep alive the spirit of investigation.—For, polemic writing like criticism, whether religious, political, or literary, seizes the general attention sooner, and holds it with a stronger grasp than writing of any other character : it forcibly urges the mind to action. Indeed, it is impossible to read or hear a keen and able discussion of an interesting question without thinking and deciding upon it. In this respect reviews are of incalculable service even to the learned ; but particularly, to that wide class, who cannot resort for information to the fountains—to elaborate works ; since these, for the reasons before given, must be confined to those whose leisure permits, or professional avocations require, their study and perusal. If the mass of mankind are ever enlightened to any good purpose, it must be by means of sound literature thrown into popular and elementary forms. And this is the very definition of periodical literature, at least in our own times.

Profound, yet divested of that diffuseness and elaborateness which repel perusal, possessing novelty and variety like newspapers, yet free from their frivolity, nonsense, and imbecility, it possesses in the greatest possible degree the excellencies, and avoids the vices, of these two species of literature ; and is interesting to all, accessible to all, useful to all. Elaborate works contain vast masses of thought like the virgin of the mine ; criticism separates the useless substances from the gold, and converts it into coin fit for general use and circulation ; leaving its intrinsic value unimpaired by the change, and its usefulness infinitely augmented.

But while the effect of illuminating the general mind has been conceded to periodical criticism, it has been again and again urged that it tends to make scholars superficial. But those who have a taste for profound and solid investigations—and there will always be such in the world—who have leisure, and the love of that respect which follows the possession and display of learning to incite them, will be profoundly learned whether the world is full of reviews or not. The pretenders to learning who take it from reviews exclusively would be superficial at all events ; the fault is in their intellectual habits, and in nothing else. But suppose reviews to be conducted with little ability, there can be no danger. Literary men would not surely rest satisfied with their discussions ; they would not even read them. Suppose them conducted with masterly talent—is it not absurd to say, that any, whether learned or not, would be any the less learned or profound for reading them ? I deny this tendency to make any description of readers rest satisfied with slight and superficial inquiries both from the general nature of criticism, and its foundation in the structure of the human mind ; and more particularly, from the exalted character it has acquir-

ed in our own times. Can it be believed that any can rise from the perusal of the critical speculations of our North American Reviewers—and of such men as Jeffrey, Playfair, Gifford, Brougham, MacIntosh, Scott, and Campbell—men of the most powerful and accomplished minds of the age, and who will be remembered by posterity as the philosophers, statesmen, poets, orators, and jurists, that have improved, and thrown a lustre around it, without being instructed as well as delighted, without having their views expanded, their understandings strengthened by sound argument, and their taste improved as well as gratified by elegant composition?

I might conclude then that Periodical Criticism instead of having this effect, would increase the number of learned men, and the aggregate amount of learning in the world: but it is a sufficient vindication of criticism to say—and it can be said with perfect safety—that it leaves the learned no less so than it found them, and not less disposed to use the means necessary to be so, while it raises a vast number to the delights and benefits of literature, who would otherwise be destitute of them.

There is still one interesting light in which the subject may be viewed in relation to the present political situation or future prospects of the world. The coming age like the last will probably be—"Evum clarum, et memorabile gratibus."—The world, it may be said, is at peace. It is. But it requires little discernment to perceive that this calm is but the portentous tranquillity that precedes the launching of the thunders, and the sweeping desolation of the storm. For monarchs have formed a combination, fearful for its vast strength and extent—a combination that will infallibly call forth resistance—to crush the spirit of liberty wherever it has appeared. They have forfeited

their repeated promises and oaths to their people to give them *chartered* security for their rights; to introduce the representative principle into their governments: and they are doing their utmost to cover the earth with the clouds of barbarism, darkness, and monkish superstition. There have been proofs of this truth in abundance; there is a memorable illustration of it at this moment. Greece! after lying 1500 years involved in the glooms of barbarian darkness—Greece! whose name no scholar ever pronounced without a glow of enthusiasm—Greece! over whose decline, fall, and multiplied oppressions genius has poured her tears and lamentations from the age of Cicero to our own—Greece has raised the song of freedom in her vales, and planted its standard on her mountains—her sons have knit the phalanx of Epaminondas again, and through a sea of blood and the desolation of their country, have almost succeeded in repelling her barbarous despots from the shore characterized but a short time since as the

"Voicelsss shore

Where the heroic harp is tuneless now,
The heroic bosom beats no more."

How then did England, so long the only example and refuge and watch-tower of freedom on the eastern continent, regard this conflict: England, whose sons are well imbued with the very spirit of Grecian literature, and bathed in its classic fountains? Did she rush to the assistance of that Greece, from an imitation of whose free spirit she has derived her pre-eminence in power, in arts, and in arms? This she would have done under the administration of a Chatham or a Fox: but a different policy now guides her councils. She has remained a cold and indifferent spectator of that conflict, or rather all she has done is to refrain from joining her arms with those of the relentless enemy of Christendom, and the remorseless assassins of men, women, and children, to

crush the almost expiring efforts of Christian Greece to be free ! Have we forgotten, in violation of the laws of nations, contrary to their consent, and by brute force, the annexation of Genoa to Sardinia, and of Venice to Austria ? under the arm of whose crushing despotism "The ocean-born and earth-commanding city is ready to sink like a sea-weed into whence she rose," and the dirge of the poet over her sinking greatness to be realized ?

O Venice ! Venice ! when thy marble walls

Are level with the waters, then shall be
A cry of nations on thy sunken halls

A loud lament along the sweeping sea !

Have we forgotten the unprincipled attack of Austria and Russia on the independence of Naples—an attack in violation of the first principles of the laws of nations : for these declare that every nation has a right to manage its own internal concerns, and modify and change its form of government as it sees fit, so long as it interferes with no other. But the growth of free institutions was a thing so pernicious to the peace and happiness of mankind that to check it was an imperious duty on the part of their royal guardians, and justified their violation of a principle to which they themselves had often appealed for their own protection. For these self-same monarchs had made it a subject of loud and repeated complaints against revolutionary France, that she had made war to impose her form of government on them ! and insisted that she had no right to intrude her liberty on other nations, if they did not want it. But they, it seems, had a right to destroy by force a constitution which a nation had made for itself, in the exercise of its free agency, and to re-establish in the fulness of unchecked and unlimited despotism, the throne of a weak and vicious tyrant amidst the curses of an indignant, but alas ! helpless nation. But we are to seek for proofs of these designs, not only

in the foreign, but in the domestic policy of these monarchs. It is a truth evidenced by their repeated attacks on every liberal and free institution, which time and tyranny had spared : by the systematic opposition to the introduction of all such as the genius of the age and the advancing improvement of mankind require ; evidences also by their pertinacious defence of existing abuses, and their persevering efforts to restore the prostrated institutions and exploded maxims of the times gone by—institutions and maxims equally at war with the intellectual dignity, the moral health, and the political happiness of man.—Now, how can this gigantic attempt to roll back the advancing tide of improvement be resisted. For unless it be resisted, liberty will be driven from Europe : she will be lost for a thousand years, perhaps for ever, and bear down with her, like a sinking ship, civilization, arts and sciences,

"And all things that humanize and bless mankind."

If the friends of freedom have the spirit to resist, with what weapon can they hope most successfully to encounter the vast superiority of physical force, which monarchs have arrayed on their side. Sound literature, I answer, but literature brought home to the fire-side, business, and bosoms of all men—literature in the shape of powerful and argumentative refutations of insidious and artful defences of abuse, tyranny, and bigotry—holding up clear valuable expositions of the true principles of civil liberty—warning mankind of the dangers that surround them, and animating them to firm, unwavering, eternal resistance ! Periodical Criticism, in other words, has appeared from the master-spirits of the age ! For criticism has, in our own times, taken a loftier height, which it has sustained on a stronger wing. It is no longer confined to the correction of the minor defects and evils

of literature. Since the establishment of the Edinburgh Review, it has assumed the grave office of guarding and defending the rights and interests of mankind; and is rapidly acquiring a vast, and we believe, will ultimately acquire, a controlling influence, over the destinies of nations. For the splendid success of the Edinburgh Review led to the immediate establishment of numerous similar publications in England, France, Germany, Italy, and every civilized country. They are increasing. They have proved the able defenders of free principles—and now every gale that blows wafts to the four quarters of the globe triumphant exposures of abuse and eloquent appeals in favour of freedom.

Let it not be said that Critical Literature may be made an engine of despotism as well as of freedom. Should despotism undertake to employ it in her cause, a conflict of opinion will immediately arise in the literary world; this will inevitably excite and enlighten *general* inquiry; and enlightened inquiry is the broad road to correct conclusions. In such a contest liberal principles have nothing to fear. Demosthenes won the argument, though Philip gained the battle. And here is the danger. The ignorance and rooted prejudices of mankind give their monarchs the control of the physical strength of society. Remove the cause, you remove the effect; and the physical, as well as moral and intellectual strength of society, will be on the side of freedom. Per-

haps I have ascribed to this cause greater agency in the production of this effect than it can fairly claim; but all who remember what criticism has done within twenty years, will consider that its influence will be very great; and every spark struck out by the collision of opinion will augment that illumination which will ultimately—we pray, hope, believe—expel political darkness from the universe!

For the Christian Spectator.

SABBATH MORNING.

THAT holy calm which breathed from
heaven,
Around the spot where Christ abode,
Which speaks the joys of sin forgiven,
And lifts the beaming eye to God;

That holy calm where passion's rage,
And earthly hope and fear are gone,
While o'er the soul's brief pilgrimage,
A softer radiance is thrown,

That holy calm thy breast shall feel,
As breaks the sabbath's dawn once more;
And, to thine inmost soul, shall steal
The presence of the Comforter.

Around the throne already meet,
The unnumbered millions of the blest;
And tune their softest notes to greet,
Another Sabbath's sacred rest.

Though high above our feeble aim,
Rolls on their "unexpressive" song,
Our souls, communion still shall claim,
And mingle with the happy throng.

On earth below, in heaven above,
The peace, the joy, the praise are one;
And soon these souls from earth remove,
Where naught but heaven remains
alone. C. A. G.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Pilot ; A Tale of the Sea. By the Author of the Spy, 2 vols. New-York.

Saratoga ; A Tale of the Revolution. 2 vols. Boston.

The Spectre of the Forest, or, Annals of the Housatonic, a New-England Romance. By the Author of the Wilderness. 2 vols. New-York.

The Witch of New-England ; A Romance. Philadelphia.

Hobomoc ; A Tale of Early Times. Boston.

A Peep at the Pilgrims in 1636. A Tale of Olden Times. By the Author of divers unfinished manuscripts, &c. Boston.

WE write this review for the special use and benefit of two large classes of human kind ;—novel-readers and novel-writers. And though we have sore misgivings that neither the one nor the other will be disposed to read, much less to regard the opinions of so grave and puritanical a personage as we are ; we are nevertheless determined to offer our sentiments, premising certain reasons why we deem them not unworthy of attention.

With a great part of these two branches of the human race, it is, we doubt not, a prevalent impression, that the writers of the Christian Spectator are, without exception, an association of lean, hard-favoured gentlemen, who have never felt one emotion softer or gentler than the zeal of controversy, who have never read any thing but the Bible and the treatises of orthodox divines, who have never aspired to the composition of any thing more tasteful than a sermon or a theological disquisition, and whose opinions on matters of taste and polite literature are therefore utterly to be condemned. In opposition to this pre-

judice, we beg leave to say, that we who guide the pen on this occasion—lean though we may be, and hard-favoured, and withal somewhat addicted to reading the Bible, and somewhat interested in the questions that lay hold upon eternity—have read more tales and romances than the author of Waverly will ever write ; have rambled through the groves by moonlight ; have indited lugubrious ditties and burning ballads ; and furthermore have been the writers of divers unfinished manuscripts quite as edifying, we dare say, as those of the gentleman who comes before the public in a motley coat to give them a peep at the Pilgrims. These things, it is true, were among the freaks of our by-gone days ; but we say that those who have been guilty of such freaks are not to be disregarded as if they were too *phlegmatic* in their constitution to have any fellow-feeling with the heroes, or any admiration for the heroines of fiction.

Another reason why we ask the attention of these two classes is, we do not design in the present article to enter into a discussion of the usefulness or lawfulness of novels in general. To our ordinary readers such a discussion would be for the most part unnecessary ; and with the extraordinary readers whom we are seeking for once to gratify, it would doubtless break off all negotiation in a moment. Omitting therefore to calculate the value of the time which is devoted to the composition and perusal of novels, or to estimate the correctness of the views which they ordinarily—not to say necessarily—give us of human life and its great business, or to analyze the feelings which they are designed to cherish ; we shall proceed directly to remark on the works whose titles stand in so formidable array at the head of this article.

The most remarkable general

characteristic of these works is their common relation to the Waverly Novels—a relation very much the same with that which “Rogers’s Columbian Coffee” bears to the real Java. Or to speak more correctly, and with more discrimination, they all sustain to their great model the relation of resemblance; and if, in the most successful of these efforts, the degree of resemblance may be set forth by the comparison just made, the value of the others may be illustrated by comparing them, in their respective degrees of merit, with “pea-coffee,” “potato-coffee,” “rye-coffee,” and whatever other “counterfeit presentment” of coffee may be still more despicable.

This common resemblance of the works before us to the Waverly Novels, makes it proper for us to signify with some degree of explicitness our opinion of those extraordinary productions. We call them extraordinary without hesitation, and without the fear of contradiction; for it cannot be doubted that they deserve and will ever retain a high rank among the standard works of English literature. Their author is the only writer of the age who has been compared with Shakspeare; and surely we offer him high praise,

“praise enough

To fill the ambition of a common man,” when we say that he is worthy of the comparison. He has not indeed that majesty of thought, or that strength and dignity of language which characterize the great dramatist; nor does he look abroad on the world and its inhabitants with such an aspect and seeming consciousness of superhuman power; nor do his works present so complete an encyclopedia of human feeling and character; nor do they contain so rich a treasure of splendid imaginations and thrilling expressions;—but still the author of Waverly is worthy to be compared with the author of Hamlet; and as the one is the acknowledged prince of dramatists, so the other has

no rival among the novelists of this or any former age.

The Great Unknown—for that seems to be at once the most convenient and the best authorized appellation—writes in a style of purer and more unaffected English than any Scotchman of our day. He enjoys the free use of his faculties; and never seems to walk in gyves like the author of Valerius, or on stilts like the Edinburgh Reviewers. His language is the mere vehicle of his thought, unstudied and unadorned; and almost the only fault which we can lay to his charge in this matter is the fault of an occasional negligence. The excellence of his style is, that the reader never thinks of it:—and as in dress, so in style, that is the best which attracts the least attention. Horne Tooke says that the best English is to be found in the conversation of well bred women. We are strongly inclined to his opinion; and though we have not looked at one of those novels for these six months, we venture to assert that the English of the Great Unknown is very much of this description.

In respect to delineation of character and knowledge of human nature he is entitled to equal praise. Throughout his volumes we may see a masterly analysis of the human mind in its boundless varieties, and a thorough acquaintance with its springs of action. His personages are not merely the heroes and heroines, the robbers and peasants of a novel—they are for the most part, human beings; and in all the diversities of character which they present, highlander and lowlander, noble and vassal, crusading knight and covenanting whig, they exhibit the passions and affections of men. They live and move before us; their names become

“Familiar in our mouths as household words;”

for we feel that they are kindred to ourselves. And all, because their individual peculiarities are consist-

ent with the laws of human nature. To this remark, however, there are exceptions, which it were foreign from our purpose to specify. Characters of immaculate goodness, and of unmingled and gratuitous wickedness, are equally remote from probability. We know that such characters are abundant in fiction, but do we meet them in the world of reality? No, Calvinists as we are called, and orthodox as we claim to be, we ever expect to find alike, blemishes on the fairest, and bright spots on the darkest specimens of our nature. There are in man certain social affections which are rarely, if ever, eradicated. There are some principles of comparative loveliness which spring up within him, like ivy and wild flowers round the columns of a fallen temple, spreading a verdure and beauty over the ruins of his moral nature. Many fine illustrations of this are given by the author in question. With few exceptions, the meanest and most abandoned of his characters have some better qualities—some relics of what the world calls virtue and Unitarians call holiness—some traces of those principles which hold society together, and keep the world from falling into chaos.

The poetry of the Waverly Novels ought not to be omitted in forming an estimate of their value. We refer not merely to the far-famed mottos from that apocryphal "Old Play," or to those songs and metrical fragments which are scattered through every volume; but to the numberless descriptions—sublime, or picturesque, or beautiful—that pass before the imagination like rainbows;—and to all those scenes, and passages, and forms of expression, that come home to the heart or the fancy with a warmth and brightness that belong only to poetry, and that realize to us the description of

"Thoughts that breathe and words that burn;"

and we say that taking poetry in this

broad sense, the author of Waverly is a poet of no ordinary character.

The stories which he tells are always more or less improbable, and often unnatural. Indeed a novel, the interest of which depends in any great degree on the plot, is necessarily exposed to the former of these charges; for a history, to be interesting, must contain some events which are strange, out of the common course, improbable. To illustrate our meaning by examples;—in Irving's beautiful sketch of 'the Pride of the Village,' there is nothing strange or startling,—the reader never asks himself, what next?—nor does the interest of the piece depend on the story at all;—it depends solely on the character and thoughts and feelings of the heroine, and our sympathy in all her emotions. It is the picture of a sensitive female mind, suffering and dying with the pangs of disappointed affection; and it is as such, and not as an eventful story, that it seizes on the attention of the reader. But in Don Quixote and Gil Blas, a great proportion of the interest is derived from the incidents of the story; and these incidents, if not individually, at least in the combination in which they are supposed to exist, are altogether improbable. Something unexpected, and frequently unaccountable, is starting up at every corner; and thus the mind of the reader is kept in a continued state of suspense, joined with a kind of half pleasing, half painful anxiety,—like the mind of a gambler over his cards, or, to compare great things with small, like the mind of a Napoleon playing the game of battle, where the dice are armies and the wager is an empire.

And here we must be permitted to remark, that this is the true secret of the mania with which some people devour every thing which is called a novel. The Creator has formed us for activity; and he has so constituted our minds as well as our

bodies, that idleness is wretchedness, and inactivity is its own punishment. This pain of inactivity is one of the springs which keep the world in motion ; but when it operates by itself, without the aid of other motives, it is insufficient to produce exertion ; and the mind under its influence will fly to novels, or to cards, or to intoxication, or a kind of feverish excitement, which, though miserable indeed, may afford some relief from absolute *ennui*. An active, powerful mind, operating in favourable circumstances, may make a man the greatest general of his age ; and the same mental activity, when peace has thrown him out of employment, may make him as great a gambler. A fashionable young lady, whom circumstances have deprived of her usual employments and amusements, may become, in the same way, a devoted novel-reader. But devoted novel-readers, as well as devoted gamblers, are formed, in most cases, by a different process. There is in works of fiction, as in gaming, a kind of fascination, which, where nothing comes in to break the charm, lures on the victim till his mind has become so stupified and deadened by dissipation, that he can find no enjoyment but in this morbid and feverish excitement. Such a reader, after having exhausted all the novels in existence,—if you could once suppose the fountains of fiction to be dried up,—would weep as the Macedonian wept when he had conquered the world ; would weep because his only source of excitement was gone, leaving nothing to save him from the listlessness of perfect inactivity.

Fictitious narrative, then, owes its charm to this. It awakens curiosity, and thus furnishes at once stimulus and employment to many a mind whose indolence would shrink from the labour of intellectual pursuits,—and whose dulness, poetry itself, “glancing from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth,” and bringing back from each excursion its images of light and thoughts of fire,—would

never be able to animate. It was for minds like these that novels were invented ; and accordingly, in the infancy of this species of writing, incident was every thing,—and to this the author was allowed to sacrifice probability and even nature. But the public mind was soon sated with fictions like these ; and it is now required of a novel-writer that he shall conform himself, so far as he knows how, to the laws of nature, and restrain the improbability of his story within certain limits, marked out—not very definitely it is true—by the canons of criticism. The Great Unknown, however, pays but little regard to these limits,—as must have been observed by every reader possessing an ordinary share of discrimination. The consistency, and probability, and effect of his story occupy but a small part of his attention. His great object seems to be, to illustrate the history, and manners, and national character of his country ; and to this every thing else, and most of all his plot, is made subordinate.

What then has been his success in this particular ? And here we acknowledge there is much to admire. He seems to have searched all the records of antiquity. Not a book, not a ballad, not a worm-eaten fragment of a manuscript, that can throw any light on the obscurity of the past, appears to have escaped his notice. He is as familiar with the transactions and manners of former ages, as we are with the events of yesterday. He can tell how lords and ladies, how nobles and vassals, were respectively attired, in the days of King Richard the Lion-hearted, as easily as a milliner can describe the latest fashions from London or Paris. He makes his republican and unromantic readers in America, as well acquainted with the pomp of a tournament, as they are with the parade of a militia review. He delineates the external influence and the internal economy of ancient monastic

institutions,—the general idleness and apathy of the monks, strangely variegated with now and then an instance of restless ambition, or perhaps of true humility and genuine but mistaken devotedness,—the constant solicitude with which they struggled to maintain the empire of ignorance,—and their gradual but speedy decline from the height of power, to weakness, to contempt, to utter extinction;—if with less accuracy, certainly with more impressiveness than has ever been done by any professed historian. Now he introduces us to the Edinburgh town council, as it was in 1736; or to the cells of the Tolbooth; and now, “as by the stroke of an enchanter’s wand,” the scene is changed, and we are in the court of Elizabeth, gazing on the magnificence of the “last days of chivalry.” Or at another time, he leads us among the glens and mountains of the Highlands, and shows us whatever he deems worthy of notice, if not with the accuracy of statistics, at least with the enthusiasm of poetry. The reader seems to himself to have visited the Highlands in person; and to have seen those wild clans, who, almost within the memory of the present generation, were wont to gather at the notes of the pibroch, and scorning all law but the will of their chieftains, contended with each other on points of honour, or came down in bands of robbers on the Saxons of the Lowlands. A dissertation on the Highlanders might have accurately described the power and character of the chieftains; but in Fergus M’Ivor Vich Jan Vohr, we see a living specimen;—it might describe the phenomena and superstitions of the second sight; but in Allan M’Aulay, they are embodied, and move palpably before us;—and the reader, who, after having studied the dissertation supposed, should become acquainted with Waverly, or the Legend of Montrose, would find himself somewhat in the pre-

dicament of a student in mineralogy, who, after having learned all that could be acquired from books, should be introduced, for the first time, to a splendid cabinet,—his conceptions, before vague and obscure, would become accurate and distinct, and worthy of the name of knowledge.

Having said thus much, by way of praise—enough, surely, to free ourselves from every suspicion of wilfully refusing honour where honour is due—we are now bold to declare that our admiration of the Waverly novels, considered in their historical character, is by no means unmingled. If an impartial disposition is an important requisite in a historian, who merely narrates facts as they actually took place; how much more important must it be in a writer like the one of whom we now speak, who attempts to describe and illustrate historical characters by attributing to them imaginary actions and sentiments. These imaginary actions and sentiments, it is evident, may have, and ought to have, a kind of historical truth,—they may, and should be, such actions as the persons described might have performed, and such sentiments as they might have uttered, consistently with their real characters. Thus, when Queen Elizabeth, mad with anger, drags forward the trembling Amy, or when Queen Mary vents her sarcasms on the Lady of Lochleven,—what the author tells us is not absolutely true, but it has all the truth that is required in works of this nature—it is true enough, as the mathematicians sometimes say, for all practical purposes. But it is plain that if the writer of a historical fiction is under the influence of any unjust partialities, he will inevitably go wrong, and falsify the truth of history. This is the case with the author of Waverly. He has his prejudices, for he is a tory—an admirer of the feudal and the Gothic in the constitution of his country. He seems

half enamoured with the good old times of romance,—the times when the stately Baron with his seneschal and minstrels, and holy confessor, reigned in his castle, surrounded with moats and drawbridges, and garrisoned by his faithful dependants, who acknowledged no duty but obedience to him, and demanded no reward but plunder;—when contending neighbours, instead of going to law, mustered their respective friends, and carried on the quarrel by force and arms;—when a feud was handed down from generation to generation, like an English chancery suit, and continually grew more and more complicated by the successive murders which were committed “just to keep the matter from going to sleep;”—when the palmer wandered from place to place, telling such lies of what he had seen in the Holy Land, as might put Sir John Mandeville, and even Fearon or Faux to shame;—when kings made war upon each other for the guerdon of a lady’s smile, or under the influence of religious fanaticism, marched with the bravest and noblest of their kingdoms to die on the plains of Syria, or under the walls of Jerusalem. He shares too deeply in the spirit which called forth from Burke that quixotic eulogium, as false as it is splendid, on the age of chivalry. He belongs to that party in the British empire whose motto is,

“Touch not a cobweb in St. Paul’s,
Lest the whole dome should fall;”—

who strenuously refuse to do away any of the absurdities of Gothic laws and feudal institutions, lest the door should be opened for endless innovation;—who would not alter, for example, one of the ridiculous forms with which a bill from the House of Commons is introduced into the House of Lords, lest it should shake the throne of Majesty, and bring in universal anarchy. Enjoying all the privileges of an Englishman, and enjoying them too with the keenest relish, he looks

with a kind of jealousy on their progressive enlargement, and loses no opportunity of throwing suspicion on the motives, or contempt on the characters of the men who purchased them at the expense of toil, and sufferings, and death. The spirit which prompted the first acts of resistance to the oppression of Charles I., he would stigmatize as rebellion; and the infatuation which, at a time when the liberties of England might have been built upon a broad and permanent basis—called from exile, and placed on the throne of his father, the Frenchified and voluptuous Charles II., he would call the bursting forth of a true and generous loyalty. Witness, in the Abbot, the attempt to place in an amiable attitude the character of Mary, and to represent her as driven from her throne by a successful combination of rebellious subjects, who disregarding alike the laws of God and the liberties of man, aimed only to secure for themselves the power which they wrested from her. And yet, if history be not a fable, that Queen had merited by her crimes all that an indignant nation heaped upon her; and among those subjects who conspired to dethrone her, were to be found, some whose patriotism was as unquestionable as the patriotism of Wallace, and of Tell, and, we will say, of Washington. Witness too, in *Old Mortality*, his representation of “those heroes of the kirk, who first uplifted her banner on the mountains.” He would make us believe that the Covenanters were a horde of wrong-headed and ferocious fanatics. With the single exception of Morton, all his specimens of their character are more or less designed to call forth either ridicule, or indignation, or contempt; and Morton himself, is represented as urged on, not by principle, but by a succession of accidents and mistakes, which made it impossible for him to act otherwise. And yet, these were the men, who, when the spirit, and

even the desire of liberty, seemed well nigh extinct; when Scotland submitted in silence to the sway of an iron-hearted and iron-handed despotism; when a tyrannical government was carrying into execution systematic measures for the annihilation of all the privileges of the subject, "and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped;"—these same Covenanters were the men, who, in such circumstances, dared to assert their rights, and maintain their liberties. These were the men, who, in that age of divine right and passive obedience, dared to act on the principle of 1776, that all power is delegated for the good of the people, and that when that power is perverted or abused, the subject is absolved from his allegiance. These were the men to whom their countrymen are under the strongest obligations, for having kept alive, at a period so inauspicious, that spirit of freedom, which so soon afterwards burst forth in one broad flame, at the era in which they now glory as "the Revolution."

But not satisfied with representing these champions of liberty, as cruel and contemptible fanatics, the author of *Waverly* would make his readers believe that whatever in their characters, as portrayed by him, is calculated to call forth either abhorrence, or pity, or disgust, was occasioned, or at least promoted, by the religion they professed. We do not deny, that among that people, goaded as they had been, into madness by oppression and persecution, there were dark and ferocious bigots, like his Balfour of Burley, or enthusiastic zealots, like Macbriar; but we do deny that such individuals ought to be brought forward as representatives of the whole. The representation is injustice to the character of Scotland; it is injustice to the memory of her martyred patriots; and it illustrates and proves the author's strong pre-

judice against what he calls their "opake metaphysical theology."

This brings us to the moral and religious character of his productions, in respect to which our highest commendation must be negative. He never exhibits the fiendish depravity of Byron, nor the Sadducean licentiousness of Moore, nor the brutal epicurism of the writers in *Blackwood's Magazine*. He always shows himself to be what is called a good sort of a good-humoured man, full of the milk of human kindness, and possessing all amiable affections together with about as much religion as may be found in Alison's sermons. The moral influence of his writings, either one way or the other, is apparently no concern of his. He makes no effort to excite those emotions which are directly injurious; nor does he ever attempt to raise us above the world, or to fill us with holier feelings. Milton would not write thus—nor Cowper—nor Wordsworth.

But we may not stop here. While we acquit him of any malicious intentions against morality or decency, we must ask, what is the moral influence of that vulgar profaneness with which all his writings are polluted?—or of that levity with which, even when speaking in his own person, he sometimes treats the holiest conceptions of religion? What parent would trust his children where they might listen to the conversation of blackguards, and bullies, and abandoned ruffians? Or, passing by the influence of familiarity with undisguised and loathsome wickedness, what must be the effect on a youthful mind, of contemplating a character like Fergus M'Ivor?—or like Rob Roy?—or like Ravenswood, proud, passionate, revengeful, but still placed in such situations and expressing such sentiments, that we seem to behold a perfect specimen of moral sublimity? And what emotions are excited when the reader sympathizes

with all that pride and passion ; blames him for not prosecuting his designs of vengeance ; and is ready to rebel against the providence, or rather, as the author would seem to represent it, the fate, which persecuted him with misfortunes, and doomed him to ruin ?

Our opinion of the Waverly Novels then, is briefly this. Looking at them as works of taste, as a monument of genius, as a manual of human nature, we give them all the praise they claim. Looking at them as historical representations, while we admire their impressiveness, we condemn their partiality, and send the reader to correct his conceptions by the less vivid, but more accurate delineations of history. Looking at them in their moral and religious tendency, we deprecate their influence. Such is the master. We pass now to his disciples, feeling that after having given so much of our attention to the former, our limits will permit us to say but little respecting the latter. That little however is enough.

Of the six novels before us, the first two, as we have arranged them, belong to the period of the revolution ; the next two, to the era of witchcraft, and the wanderings of King Charles's judges ; and the last two, to the days of the Pilgrims. These three periods have been pointed out by the North American Reviewers, as abounding in all the materials of historical romance ; and the materials which they are supposed to afford, the writers under review have attempted to collect and to embody. And we are bold to say that they have attempted it to little purpose.

In respect to the interest of the narrative, and the skill with which the plot is conducted, and the power and vividness of the execution, "*The Pilot*" is unquestionably superior to all its competitors. It is evidently written with care, and by a man of very considerable talents.

The action is rapid and varied, giving the author an opportunity of describing, in the history of a very few days, sea-fights, and tempests, and a shipwreck, and the taking of a whale ; all which are so well done, that we should have known, even if he had not intimated it, that he has "seen a whale." Besides this we have the common-place matters of a novel, such as mistakes and disguises, stratagems and counter-stratagems, the whispering of lovers, and the listening of spies, imprisonments and escapes, unexpected distress, and unhopd for deliverance ; all so craftily woven together as to create a deep and feverish interest. But the proper way of testing the merit of such a work, is to return to it again and again, after the interest of the story is exhausted, and thus to study the skill with which characters are drawn, and the consistency with which they are sustained. The Waverly novels will stand this test, and at every new perusal they disclose new beauties. But he who applies it to the *Pilot*, will find that though its author has been remarkably successful in a few caricature delineations, his other characters are failures almost equally remarkable. His two heroines are astonishingly affected and uninteresting, and though they are fairly matched with their lovers, we can see nothing about them unless it be the "thirty thousand dollars," that could tempt a discreet bachelor into matrimony. Nor is he more fortunate in his only historical personage—the pilot, alias Mr. Gray, alias Paul Jones,—a silent, starched, mystery-loving man in a 'pee-jacket,' who always comes just when he is most needed ; who always does just what nobody else could do, and who bears even less resemblance to the Paul Jones of history, than the Mr. Harper who figures in the *Spy* does to General Washington. It would be no doubt a very useless question to ask this writer, whether

he can do nothing better for his country and for the world than to indite such novels; and we shall therefore content ourselves with suggesting to him that his style betrays a continual effort to be smart, and that it were better for him, if he will write, to say what he has to say, without trying to say it so exquisitely.

"*Saratoga*" is a plain old-fashioned regularly constructed novel, with a hero of the Sir Charles Grandison school—the pink of courtesy, the mirror of soldiership, perfect in form and feature, noble in spirit, brave, and generous, and unaffected, breaking no hearts, uttering no profaneness, fighting no duels. It gives us the courtship of three pair of lovers, all of whom are happily married—as all lovers should be—near the close of the second volume. It introduces us to British officers and revolutionary patriots, to Mohawks* and quakers, to Irish emigrants and American refugees; but without producing any very vivid impression of the scenes with which it is designed to acquaint us. The author has manifested his discretion by leaving out all the important historical personages of the period which he describes, with the single exception of Benedict Arnold, who is introduced into only one short scene;—in which respect the author of the *Pilot* might profit by his example. He has manifested his decency by leaving out all that profane vulgarity which is so abundant in the *Pilot*. He has manifested his respect for religion by leading his hero to talk and act like a Christian, over the couch of the dying;—and the moral effect of his work is on the whole, perhaps, as good as may be expected in a work of this nature. It may be less popular than the *Pilot*, but it is at the same time less pernicious

* It makes us smile to see the names which the author gives to his Indians. So intelligent a writer ought to know that the language of the Mohawks is destitute of labials.

in its tendency. And we will venture to add that in other respects it need not shrink from the comparison. If it exhibits fewer flights of genius, it nevertheless displays more correctness of taste. If it presents less to awaken admiration, it presents less also to occasion disgust. Both are respectable when compared with ordinary novels; and both, when placed by the great standard after which they were modelled, are lost in their own insignificance. The author of *Saratoga* has had little occasion, we believe, to be intoxicated with the popularity of his production;—and as he seems to be a man of considerable sense, we hope he may be persuaded to engage in some occupation more useful to society; than the manufacture of novels ever was, or can be.

The next book on our catalogue, namely, "*The Spectre of the Forest*," is, to our apprehension, the most contemptible of all possible books. The great poet has said, that

"Nature breeds perverse,
All monstrous, all prodigious things;"—

and we would not rashly set limits to her fecundity in this respect; but after yawning at the stupidity, and marvelling at the ignorance and absurdity of this book, we were fully of opinion that "the force of nature could no farther go." If we thought any good could come of the intimation, we would gladly suggest to the author, that General William Goffe was altogether a different being from his "spectre"—a man of more dignity than to run about by night in a fool's dress, frightening women and children out of their little wits, and a man of more sense than to thrust his head in every where, to the imminent danger of his own safety and the safety of all his friends.

The "*Witch of New-England*" is founded on the same historical facts with *The Spectre of the Forest*. If we were to institute a set comparison between the authors of these two works, we might say that the former

has more mind, and the latter more correctness of information—the former sometimes succeeds in producing a passage of comparative interest and power, the latter presents one dull, dead level of stupidity—the latter disgusts us by betraying so imperfect an acquaintance with the scenery and manners he professes to describe, the former amuses us by his complete and perfect ignorance of the same—the former seems to have wrought in all the undigested historical fragments which he had chanced to find either in the newspapers or in the “Columbian Preceptor,” the latter retains throughout, if we mistake not, the peculiar graces of his own style and diction—the former excels in syntax, the latter in orthography—the former *might* write a better book, the latter has done his best, we believe—his worst, we are sure—we should be at a loss to recommend the latter to any employment; the former, after a little more attention to the spelling-book, might make a decent school master. At any rate we desire that both may suspend the writing of “New-England Romances,” at least long enough to learn that the Puritans of New-England were not “Presbyterians.”

“*Hobomoc*” is a book of no great pretensions and of some literary merit. The author has laid his scene, in the very earliest period of our history, at Salem and Plymouth. We cannot say that he is entirely ignorant of the Pilgrims; but we do say that he seems to us like one of their degenerate descendants. While he speaks of their characters in the language of respect, he entertains no sympathy with their spirit, and disguises not his contempt of their principles.

The “*Peep at the Pilgrims*,”—if we may judge not only by its crimson back and curiously mottled covers, but by the whiteness of its paper and the elegance of its typography,—was designed to make a figure in the world;—which design, we must say, has entirely failed. Aside from

its mechanical execution the book is in no way remarkable, unless it be for the fact that the mind of the author seems to fasten with a peculiar interest on the business of eating and drinking, as if each repast were of all human transactions the most worthy to be recorded in his narrative. The hero of the story is landed at Plymouth; and after staying there long enough to fall in love, and to become acquainted with the colony, goes to Boston, to New-York, to Saybrook, to the Pequot war, and gets back just in time to be married in the last chapter. The author seems pretty well acquainted with the history and local antiquities of New-England, but in describing the Dutchmen of New-Amsterdam, he places rather too *implicit* reliance on the authority of the judicious and accurate Knickerbocker. Our advice to him is that he keep his “unfinished manuscripts” *nine years*;—at the end of which period he will be in the course of nature nine years older than he now is, and if he is three years wiser, he will be too wise to publish another such book as the *Peep*.

Our readers have seen by this time, that we are not of the number of those who make a principle of praising every American book, good or bad, for the sake of encouraging American literature. We wish well to the literary character of our country, and we rejoice in its rapid improvement. But we doubt whether the literature of the United States will advance more speedily to a point of high respectability if

“Every dunce whose fingers itch to write” is to be daubed, as soon as his book comes forth, with the untempered mortar of an indiscriminating praise, than it will if the book that deserves applause receives it, and the book that has no merit is neglected or condemned. We believe that the growth of our literature will be more healthful, if not more rapid, when reviewers and declaimers

shall let alone what is to be, and apply themselves to render due justice to what is. It were as wise to mark out the path of an unborn meteor, as to describe the orbit in which genius shall move. When genius appears among us, we shall know it; for it will need no disclaimer to puff it into notice, and no reviewer to direct its aim. When genius appears, it will shine with its own glory—it will follow its own direction; and till it appear, let us wait in patience for its coming. What good have the North American Reviewers done by their repeated declamations on the adaptedness of our history to the purposes of poetry and romance? Have they called forth the man who could realize the glowing pictures of their fancy?—What then has been the result? Why, such books as the novels before us have come up on the breadth of the land like the frogs of Egypt.

After having said all this, we shall not be so inconsistent as to say that our history is *not* adapted to the purposes of fiction; for it would be as presumptuous to limit the creations of genius as it is idle to direct them. But we deem it neither inconsistent nor presumptuous to say, that before our history shall be successfully wrought into fiction, some master spirit must arise, who shall “attain to the first three,” and rank, at the lowest, with Homer, and Milton, and Shakspeare. The national poetry of any people consists in their national feelings and national recollections. In England and Scotland, and in all the nations of the old world, these recollections are such as admit of being embellished by the power of fiction. The poet gathers his materials from the quarry, and shapes them at his will. But our history affords no quarry of rude and unsightly forms. What sculptor could chisel the Medicean Venus into more ethereal beauty?—or

shape the Belvidere Apollo to the image of a nobler manliness?

We do not say—as some have said—that our history is too plain, too much a matter of fact, to be poetical or romantic. Our opinion is altogether the reverse of this. American history is too poetical for poetry, too romantic for romance. The philosophy of the fact is this. The poet and the romancer, if they are to be successful, must transcend, or at least, come up to the previous conceptions of their readers; and our history is already so abundant in high and thrilling recollections, that it seems to be incapable of further embellishment.

It may be that some great spirit will speedily come forth and demonstrate by experiment the falsity of our opinion. If so, we shall not be the last to hail his success. But of one thing we are well assured. The man who shall work the Puritans into fiction should be able to comprehend their character. He should sympathize with their stern inflexibility of principle, with the loftiness of their purposes, with the enthusiasm of their hopes, with the fervency of their devotion. Such a man would have an advantage to begin with. But such men as the writers of these novels—what can they know of the Pilgrims? Nothing. And the memory of the fathers is too pure and sacred to be profaned by the touch of sacrilege. We warn them off. *Procul! Oprocul!* The ground is holy and they may not pollute it. Shall such as they be permitted to trample on our fathers' sepulchres? It is a profanation of things consecrated. It is like letting in a company of asses to graze on the sides, and to bray on the summit of Parnassus. Or to use a more appropriate and less heathenish comparison, it is like bringing the owls and satyrs of Babylon to hoot and to dance in the temple on Mount Zion.

Easy Lessons in Reading; for the use of the younger classes in Common Schools. By Joshua Leavitt. Second Edition; Keene, N. H. Published by John Prentiss. 1825.

IT is no easy matter to make a proper selection of exercises in reading. A large part of the works which bear this title, are as badly adapted to the object in view, as can well be conceived. This arises, in a great measure, from mistaking the proper character of such works, and the end which they are designed to answer. The object of such a compilation is not merely nor chiefly, to present a collection of elegant literature, adorned with all the graces of language, and ornaments of the imagination. It is not to store the mind with maxims of wisdom, or to collect those rich combinations of thought and sentiment, which do honour to our language. The *primary* object of such compilations, in short, is not to instruct the mind, or to refine the taste, but to furnish the readiest means of practice, for the attainment of a natural, graceful, and forcible elocution. Such an elocution, is indeed, an humble attainment, compared with moral worth, or cultivated intellect. Still it is of great value; and the works designed for this end, while they are subservient, as far as possible, to higher objects, should be shaped with a peculiar reference to ease, variety, and force of delivery. But these are exactly the points which have been forgotten, by most compilers of such works. What child can read the stately and measured sentences of Johnson or Robertson, without acquiring a monotonous manner? And yet, it is from these writers, and others of a similar character, from moral essays, sermons, and the more elevated passages of history, that most selections are made.

Good reading has been well defined, to be "talking from a book." To make the definition complete,

we have only to add, that this talking should be adapted to the character of what is said. If the thoughts are light and airy, the manner of expressing them, will naturally be the same. As the subject of conversation becomes more important, and our interest increases, the tones are more marked, the emphasis stronger, the whole manner more elevated. Thus we rise from the familiarity of colloquial address, to the sustained energy of public speaking; while the nature and variety, essential to a good elocution, are still preserved. But it is important to remark, that this variety and native ease, can never be cultivated by *commencing* our practice with the higher classes of composition. It is one of the last attainments of the speaker, or reader, to unite dignity with ease, to be at once impressive and natural. This high excellence can be reached, only by long practice on the familiar style; till the natural manner is too firmly established, to be lost in the increased dignity and importance of the thought. It is for this very reason, that exercises in reading, should not be selected from the finest portions of our literature; for their excellence as compositions generally implies some departure from plainness and familiarity of thought and construction. "In what manner shall I correct a *tone* in my delivery?" said one friend to another. "Read the advertisements of a newspaper," was the reply, "and see whether you can possibly do it with a tone." This we believe, is the true secret of a cure or prevention, in respect to this worst of habits in delivery. A solemn enunciation of trifles is too ridiculous to be endured, even by the most inveterate drawler.

We believe, therefore, that even for youth who are considerably advanced in years, our exercises in reading are generally of too elevated a character. It is not, however, mere elevation of thought which

creates the difficulty. The speeches of Lord Chatham and Mr. Fox, are always easy to pronounce, although perpetually rising to the highest strains of impassioned feeling. But the speeches of the younger Pitt, and of Mr. Sheridan, are difficult to the most practised speaker, and almost invariably produce a tone in the young beginner. The cause is obvious, on the slightest glance at the structure of their style. In the former case, the clauses are all short, even though the sentences are sometimes long. All is thrown lightly off, in a rapid and continuous flow. In the latter, the sentences are perplexed, and involved, loaded with qualifying clauses, which suspend the sense and exhaust the breath. Even where this is not the case, the style of some of the finest compositions in our language is not well fitted for delivery. The letters of Junius, for example, though exhibiting in a high degree, the marshalled force of language, are among the most difficult of all productions to read or speak in an appropriate manner. Their eloquence, though of a high order, is not the eloquence of spoken language. The same is true of most essays and histories; and we see in Fox's distinguished eminence as a speaker, and his failure in the style of his great historical work, how different are the essential qualities of written and spoken composition. It is, therefore, from speeches, and other productions which approach most nearly to the conversational style, that "Exercises in reading" should be selected. If this be true of all works belonging to this class, it is peculiarly true, of those which are designed for the use of children. Nothing has a more direct tendency to destroy all ease and nature, in reading, than to put Murray's English Reader, or Introduction, into their hands. Young children need familiar dialogues; plain and simple narratives, and interesting descrip-

tions, in a style approaching to that which they use themselves. But in reading "The Abdication of Charles V.," or the story of "Altamont," they mouth it like one of Shakspeare's players; and by aiming at what they cannot reach, make their whole reading ridiculous.

The author of the work before us has therefore done a real benefit to the cause of education, by compiling a book of "Exercises in reading, for the use of the younger classes," with a strict reference to the real object of such a work. While it will interest children deeply, it will teach them, if judiciously used, to read in a natural and simple manner. The selections are chiefly made from the writings of Dr. Aikin, Mrs. Edgeworth, Mrs. Barbauld, Mrs. Sherwood, and others, who were among the first, after so many ages, to discover what children need for their amusement and instruction. In making these selections, he has, with perfect propriety, compressed and altered many passages, with reference to the primary object of ease in reading. To aid the instructor, he has marked the emphasis, and, in some instances, the inflections, with great judgment and correctness. We will not undertake to say that the emphasis could in no instance be differently given, with equal, or even with greater propriety. On this subject, after all the attempts of Walker, something must be left to the taste of the reader, and the peculiar structure of the sentence. But Mr. L. has applied the rules of Walker, with judgment and success. We apprehend, however, that the emphasis and inflections, as marked in this work, should be cautiously attempted by children, without the guidance of the teacher. It is a characteristic of children, to overdo every thing they attempt; and unless some caution is exercised on this subject, a hard and heavy manner of reading may be acquired, in

the very endeavour to emphasize with correctness. In the hands of a judicious teacher, however, the work will prove of great use; and we would strongly recommend it to the public, as excellently adapted to the end in view.—We subjoin some extracts from the preface, and one of the Exercises.

“It is a very useful practice, for the teacher to read over each sentence, before the scholar, giving it the proper pauses, inflections, and emphasis; and then to require the scholar to repeat it, until he can pronounce it with propriety. The proper and easy use of tones, emphasis, and inflections, is partly a matter of taste, and partly mechanical. The child must acquire the *habit* of reading well, by the *practice* of reading well. Prevention is better than cure. It is a leading object of this little work to prevent children from acquiring a tone, or any other bad habit in reading, which will afterwards cost them much pains to cure.

“Barely giving a general rule is not found to be sufficient in teaching any other branch, either of learning or art. Neither is it sufficient in the noble science of Elocution. The young learner must have not only rules, but lessons, instructions, and examples, *living* examples, ‘line upon line, and precept upon precept.’

“Let not the faithful teacher consider the time spent in learning his scholars to read with spirit and force, as wholly wasted and lost. In addition to the important practical uses of good reading, he may be assured that the great end of education, that of forming the young and tender mind to virtue and usefulness, is promoted by no branch of science more effectually, than by learning to read.

“To help the young learner in the proper application of Emphasis, many emphatic words are printed in *Italic characters*, according to the plan of Burgh’s Art of Speaking. President Dwight pronounced that to be altogether the best method of printing school books. It will be found that, in the present work, the Italics are far less numerous, than in that of Mr. Burgh. The nature of Emphasis, has been better understood, since the publication of Walker’s Elements of Elocution, and Rhetorical Grammar.”

* * * * *

“Rules for Reading.

- “1. Be careful to call your *words* right.
- “2. Learn to *pronounce* them properly.
- “3. Speak with a *clear* and *distinct* voice.
- “4. Do not read too *fast*. Read *slow* and *carefully*, so as not to make any *mistakes*.
- “5. Be very particular to observe all the *Stops*.

“6. Learn to use the proper *Emphasis*, and *Inflections* of the voice. Ask your teacher to show you what that means, and how to do it.

“7. Endeavour to *understand* every word you read, as you go along. *Study* your reading lessons *very* carefully, before you read.

“8. Try to read as if you were telling a story to your mother, or talking with some of your play-mates. *Reading is talking out of a book*.

“9. Take pains to *read* the poetry and not *sing* it.

“10. The emphatic words are printed in *Italic letters*.”

* * * * *

“Theory and Practice.

“1. One evening during the vacation, Frank, a tall school boy, amused his young brother, Harry, by reading an *essay*, which had given him the first prize at school. The subject was *Self-Denial*. Frank was a *clever* lad, and had acquitted himself very well. He represented his subject in so *striking* a light, that it made a considerable *impression* on the mind of his young auditor; who as soon as it was finished, *thanked* his brother for his good advice, and expressed his determination of endeavouring to *profit* by it.

“2. ‘I am afraid,’ said he, ‘I have never *learned* to deny myself as I *ought*, but I hope, brother Frank, that I shall not *forget* this lesson of yours; I wish you would be so kind as to give me some *more* good advice about it.’

“3. Now, Frank, instead of considering this the *best possible* compliment that could be paid to his composition, felt *disappointed*, that, instead of commenting upon the *force* of his *arguments*, or the *graces* of his *style*, he should begin gravely to *moralize* upon it: and confirmed him in a favourite opinion of his, that his brother Harry had not a *spark* of *genius*, nor ever would have.

“4. Harry repeated his request, but finding his brother more inclined to discuss the merits, and relate the success of his essay, than to draw a *practical improvement* from it, he contented himself with his own private reflections.—‘To-morrow,’ said he to himself, ‘to-morrow morning I will begin.—But why not begin *to-night*,’ continued he. The clock had just struck, and Harry recollected that his mother had desired them not to sit up a minute after the clock struck *nine*. He reminded his *brother* of this order.

“5. ‘Never mind,’ said Frank—‘Here’s a *famous* fire, I shall stay and *enjoy* it.’—‘Yes,’ said Harry, ‘Here’s a famous fire, and I should *like* to *stay* to enjoy it, but that would not be *self-denial*, would it Frank?’

“‘Nonsense!’ said Frank, ‘I shall not

stir yet, I promise you.' 'Then good-night to you,' said Harry.

"6. Now whether or not his brother was correct in his opinion, of Harry's want of *genius*, we shall not stay to enquire; indeed it is a question of very little importance either to us, or him, since it cannot be denied, that his *reflections*, and especially his *conduct* then, even on a trifling occasion, displayed *good sense* and *strength of character*; and these are *sterling* qualities, for which the brightest sparks of *genius* would be a *poor* exchange.

"7. Six o'clock was the time at which Harry was to *rise*, but not unfrequently, since the cold weather set in, he had indulged an hour longer.

"When it struck six next morning, he started up, but the air felt so frosty, that he had a strong inclination to lie down again. 'But no,' thought he, 'here's a fine opportunity for *self-denial*,' and up he jumped without further hesitation.

"8. 'Frank, Frank, said he to his sleeping brother, 'past six o'clock, and a fine star-light morning.' 'Let me alone,' cried Frank, in a cross, drowsy voice. 'Very well then,' said Harry, 'a pleasant nap to you;' and down he ran, as *gay* as a lark.

"After finishing his latin exercise, Harry had time to take a pleasant walk before breakfast this morning, so that he came in fresh and rosy with a *good appetite*, and what was still *better*, in *good humour*.

"9. But poor Frank, who had just tumbled out of bed when the prayer-bell rung, came down, looking pale, and cross, and cold, and discontented.

"Harry, who, if he was no *genius*, had some sly *drollery* of his own, was just beginning to rally him on his forlorn appearance, when he recollected his *resolution*. 'Frank does not like to be laughed at, especially when he is cross,' thought he; so he suppressed his joke, and it requires some *self-denial* even to suppress a joke.

"10. 'I should like another half, I think, mother,' said Frank, that day at dinner, just as he had despatched a large semicircle of mince pie.

"'Any more for you, my dear Harry?' said his mother. 'If you please—no, thank you though,' said Harry, withdrawing his plate, 'for,' thought he, 'I have had enough, and more than enough to satisfy my hunger,' and now is the time for *self-denial*.'

"11. 'Brother Harry,' said his little sister, after dinner, 'when will you show me how to do that pretty puzzle, you said you would, a long time ago?'

"'I am busy now child,' said Harry—'don't tease me now, there's a good girl.' She said no more, but looked disappointed, and still hung upon her brother's chair.

"'Come then,' said Harry, suddenly recollecting himself, 'bring me your puzzle,' and laying down his book, he very good naturedly showed his little sister how to place it.

"12. That night, when the two boys were going to bed, Harry called to mind, with some complacency, the several instances in the course of the day in which he had succeeded in exercising *self-denial*; and he was on the very point of telling his brother Frank what he was thinking of.

'But, no,' thought he, 'here is another opportunity still, of *denying* myself; I will not say another word about it; besides, to *boast* of it, would *spoil all*.'

"13. So Harry laid down quietly, making the following sage reflection:—'This has been a very pleasant day to me, and although I have done several things against my will, I find that *self-denial* is painful for a moment, but very pleasing in the end. If I go on this plan every day, I shall have a good chance of having a happy life, for life is made up of days and hours, and it will be just as pleasant and as easy.'

"14. But here Harry's thoughts began to wander, and soon became quite indistinct. In fact, he was sound asleep before he had half finished his reflections, and the remainder must be supplied by the reader."

To the Editor of the *Christian Spectator*.

THE following communication, addressed to the Editor of the *Christian Examiner*, was originally written with an intention to offer it for publication in that work. For reasons, however, which need not be specified, I have preferred to request its insertion in the *Spectator*.* Yours, &c.

L. BEECHER.

To the Editor of the *Christian Examiner*.

SIR,

I RECEIVED and read the review of my Sermon, delivered at Worcester, in your number for Jan. 1824; and most of the remarks which I propose to submit to your consideration were written in the early part of that year; but circumstances which I need not explain, have prevented their publication until now.

It is not to be expected or claimed, that an author shall in all re-

* As this article comes to us in the shape of a 'communication,' it might seem to belong more properly to another department of our work:—On account, however, of its length and character, we assign it a place here.

spects be gratified in the exhibition which is made of his opinions and arguments : and yet there are doubtless rules of controversy which the laws of equity acknowledge and protect.

We are bound, for example, if we attempt to answer an extended complex argument, to give the argument entire ; for moral evidence is but the accumulation of probabilities ; and a partial statement of the argument is in effect a misrepresentation of it, as it supposes the writer to rely on the argument which is stated and replied to, when it may be that he relies on it only as taken in connexion with the facts which are omitted.

In answering a complex argument, each particular which goes to constitute the entire argument, should be stated in its logical form, and in the words of the writer, or in language equally intelligible. Otherwise how can the reader know what the argument is, or whether the reply be relevant or not ? A mere allusion to the argument, without a statement of it in logical form, may answer the purpose of evasion, or declamation, or irrelevant reply, but never will answer the purpose of fair and honourable controversy.

It is equally plain that each argument replied to, should be met and answered as it is understood and relied on by our antagonist.

However near the reply may approach to the point of the argument, if it does not meet it directly, the more ingenious is the sophistry, and the more provoking are the misrepresentations ; because, being numerous and of such nice discrimination, the reader is soon tired of sitting in judgment on such little matters, and the culprit when this end is achieved, turns and hurls back on his injured antagonist the odium of nice metaphysical distinction, and of vain jangling. One might as well go out "to seek a flea or to hunt a partridge in the mountains," as to follow up with ar-

gument such dodging antagonists. And whether such conduct indicates a desire to know the truth or to avoid it, it is not difficult to perceive.

Another obvious rule of controversial equity is, that where matters of fact constitute the argument, the facts, be noted in their logical bearing, and be replied to in point. Facts, when relevant, constitute the most invincible argument. Theories are nothing in their presence, and no honourable alternative remains, but to show their irrelevancy, or to admit the conclusion to which they tend. Silence in respect to them, or a mere allusion to them which affords no conception of their place and bearing in the argument, is inconsistent with argumentative uprightness.

Should the violation of these rules be the result of mistake, it would evince only incompetency for controversial writing. But if they should be the result of design, it would indicate insincerity in our search after truth, and a dishonourable and criminal disregard of moral principle. The man who in natural science should resort to such measures to conceal or baffle the argument of his antagonist, would be regarded justly as the enemy of science. But how highly is the crime aggravated when the concealment or evasion attempted respects revealed truth, and as the case may be, those truths which are necessary to save men from destruction and qualify them for heaven.

Such unworthy conduct in theological writers has created already an extensive prejudice against controversy as the means of discovering truth ; and the continuance of it by men of the clerical profession, would increase that prejudice greatly, and would forfeit justly the confidence which a Christian public ought to be authorized to repose in their spiritual guides. If we consider also the unavoidable imperfection of language as the vehicle of thought,

and the utter inefficacy of civil coercion in the development and preservation of truth, we shall perceive the necessity of an enlightened public opinion, which shall lay the tax of shame and of crime upon argumentative dishonesty.

The rights of conscience are not to be invaded, but neither are they to be exercised with impunity in a wanton and unprincipled manner. The interests of the community in revealed truth are as sacred as the rights of property—and the wilful perversion of an argument ought to be coupled with dishonour and crime in the public estimation, as really as chicanery in law, the sequestration of property by theft, or the perversion of justice by a false oath.

The object of religious controversy is not the concealment, but the discovery of the truth; not the display of dexterity in evading an argument, but of magnanimity in embracing its results; not the gratification of our pride, but the edification of our hearts by receiving the truth in the love of it.

Nothing, I am aware, is more common than mutual accusations of unfairness in religious controversy, and the sorry exhibition of petulance and invective: and the disgust I have felt at such exhibitions has kept me from personal controversy to this day. And if I thought that in the remarks I am about to make, I should only add to these humiliating specimens of imbecility and acrimony, I would instantly lay down my pen.

But the subject of the sermon is one on which I have entered with other motives than the desire of victory, and with other feelings towards Unitarians than those of unkindness. I believe sincerely, that the doctrines which they reject are the Gospel, and are necessary to their salvation;—that the truth only is able to save them; and that error, however sincerely believed, will not save them.

I had occasion to know that those who sit under Unitarian ministrations, do extensively and greatly misapprehend the doctrines which are held by the orthodox, and that they do honestly suppose the orthodox to believe and teach things which they utterly disclaim and abhor. It was my wish, therefore, to place before these children of the pilgrims a plain, popular statement of the doctrines of their fathers, as they are now understood and believed by their orthodox brethren; believing that they with us may as yet be within the circumference of that covenant whose blessings go down to the thousandth generation of them that fear God and keep his commandments, as our fathers feared and obeyed.

I wished also to accompany this explanatory statement of the orthodox faith with some of those arguments which have long, to my mind, appeared unanswerable. And, Sir, I did indulge the hope that the truth, freed from misapprehension and contemplated in its native majesty, simplicity, and beauty, and attended by its proper evidence, might allay the prejudices of many against it, commend itself to their consciences and their hearts, and become to them the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. But however this hope might be realized or not, I did expect the gratification of knowing, and felt no small degree of curiosity to know, what could be said to my argument, by able honest men in whom I could detect no sophistry, but who should look it in the face and answer it to the point.

And now, Sir, allow me to say, that it affords me no pleasure to affirm that my objects in writing and in desiring an answer, have been defeated, so far as the influence of the review is concerned; and defeated in a manner which involves, in my judgment, a violation of the preceding equitable rules of controversy.

No person who reads only the review, can possibly possess himself

of my entire argument, or understand the logical point and bearing of each particular argument, or what *generally* are the matters of fact relied on, or what is the logical bearing of those which are *alluded* to. And what is still more to be regretted is, that the reply to particular arguments which is attempted, is made to the arguments, rather as alluded to than as logically stated—and evades the point of the argument by replying to a position which the argument nowhere assumes. I am far from charging the reviewer with design in this logical aberration. But it did early occur to my mind, and has repeatedly been suggested to me by others, that if the reviewer had feared the effect of the doctrines and arguments, as stated in the Sermon, upon Unitarian congregations, and had set himself to write a review which should prevent them from knowing how the doctrines were stated and by what arguments they were supported, and at the same time to create such a prejudice against the Sermon as would keep the people generally from reading and judging for themselves, he could not have managed more adroitly than he has done.

But in addition to this disappointment of all my reasonable, and as I must say, my benevolent hopes, I am charged with duplicity in what I have done. According to the reviewer, I have given an epitome of doctrine as the faith delivered to the saints which is decidedly anti-calvinistic, and have falsely claimed that it is substantially the faith of the Reformers, the Puritans, the Fathers of New-England, and the great body of the Orthodox in our country.

Thus disappointed and misrepresented, I have to request that you will do me the justice to re-publish a corrected statement of my argument and a vindication of my good name in your Miscellany,—the only vehicle of information which can render the redress as extensive as

the injury. The love and fearless pursuit of the truth professed by Unitarians, justify the confidence with which I appeal both to your candour and to your magnanimity.

Should the length of the article seem to furnish an apology for declining its insertion, you will readily perceive that if the mistakes in the review had been fewer, my reply had been proportionably shorter, and that equity demands that the explanation be co-extensive with the occasions for it which are created by misrepresentations, however undesigned. Had my arguments been suppressed or misrepresented by typographical mistakes, the length of the errata would not be deemed a reason for refusing their insertion; and it will not seem to you, I trust, a matter of much consequence in respect to the claims of justice, whether the causes of the injury sustained are mechanical, or intellectual, or moral.

I shall first attend to the charge preferred against me, of substituting the Arminian for the Calvinistic system, and of claiming, ignorantly or wickedly, that it is the faith of the orthodox now, and the faith of the fathers of New-England, of the puritans and of the reformers.

This system, which I have denominated evangelical, the reviewer declares to be an innovation upon the popular (Calvinistic) faith, and that it is neither strictly nor even substantially the same with the doctrines held by the reformers, the puritans, the fathers of New-England, or the great body of the orthodox in our country. It is, he declares, decidedly anti-calvinistic, expressly denying some of the peculiarities of Calvinism, distinctly asserting none of them, nor even implying one of them, in a manner to make it obvious to the mind of a common reader. Upon these charges I remark,

1. That the calvinistic and anti-calvinistic systems of doctrine are in direct opposition on those points

which constitute the two systems, and that between them there is no middle system. Man is or he is not entirely depraved : he needs or he does not need a moral renovation to fit him for heaven. This renovation is achieved by the special influence of the Holy Spirit, as a free sovereign gift, or it is in some way secured by good works, and human endeavours. Men are justified by faith only, or they are not ; and all saints do persevere, or they do not. Calvinists take one side on these points, and Arminians take the other, and there is no middle ground.

2. The Arminian system of doctrine and the Unitarian are the same on those points in which both differ from the Calvinistic system. Unitarians acted with the remonstrants when the Arminian system was formed. It is the system adopted generally, and defended in opposition to Calvinism by English Unitarians, and is the system substantially which Dr. Ware supports in agreement with Taylor, and in opposition to Edwards and Dr. Woods. The Arminian and Unitarian systems of doctrine are therefore the same, as opposed to Calvinism.

3. Unitarians claim that the anti-calvinistic system is the true primitive faith. They hold that their interpretation of the Bible on the doctrinal points, is according to the mind of the Spirit—is the truth as understood and professed by the primitive church :—Therefore,

4. The doctrines contained in the evangelical system, as it is denominated in the Sermon, are the faith delivered to the saints, the reviewer himself being judge. He does not complain of me for claiming them as such, but only for claiming their agreement with the Calvinistic system—which he denies. He declares that the Calvinistic system is not, and that the anti-calvinistic system is, the faith delivered to the saints, and that the system which I have set forth is decidedly anti-calvinistic, and is of course the

faith once delivered to the saints. The reviewer therefore claims the doctrines laid down in the evangelical system as the true anti-calvinistic, Unitarian, primitive faith. He claims that I have abandoned the the Calvinistic system, and have come over to the Arminian Unitarian faith, and the only front of my offending is, that not having the capacity to perceive, or the magnanimity to avow my conversion to Arminianism, I have attempted to persuade the public that this anti-calvinistic Unitarian creed of mine is substantially the faith of the reformers, the puritans, the fathers of New-England, and the great body of the orthodox in our country.

When I first read these charges I was disposed to bestow a smile upon them and let them pass. But in attending to the course of the controversy between Unitarians and the orthodox, I perceived what appeared to me a settled determination in Unitarians, to make the impression on the public mind that every variation in the explanation, statement, and proof of our doctrines, occasioned by the progress of mental philosophy, or of biblical criticism, or by Unitarian misrepresentations, is an abandonment of our first principles and an approximation to Unitarianism. I have heard the boastings reiterated of Professor Stuart's approximation to Unitarianism, and of my own Arminian tendencies in preaching : and lately I have read in Dr. Channing's Sermon, that "It is a plain matter of fact, that the hard features of that religious system, which has been 'received by tradition from our fathers,' are greatly softened ; and that a necessity is felt by those who hold it, of accommodating their representations of it more and more to the improved philosophy of the human mind and to the undeniable principles of natural and revealed religion. Unconditional election is seldom heard of among us. The imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is has-

tening to join the exploded doctrine of Transubstantiation. The more revolting representations of man's state by nature are judiciously kept out of sight ; and what is of still greater importance, preaching is incomparably more practical than formerly."*

* If the meaning of Dr. Channing be, that the doctrines which as mere abstract positions wear a repelling aspect, are as now explained, seen to be, the regular parts of a great system of moral government, in the administration of which justice and mercy are reconciled, and that mental philosophy has lent her aid in this exposition ; that the doctrine of election is now so stated as admits of accountability and punishment, and stops the mouths of gainsayers ; that the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness are so stated, as to appear both practicable and rational, and that the doctrine of total depravity is now explained in a manner which shows both the falsehood and the absurdity of the statements and objections made concerning it, by its opponents ; or, that as the doctrines of the Bible are better understood, they produce an increase of practical preaching, it might all be admitted as a concise account of what we believe to be true. But if Dr. C. intends to insinuate or to say, that any one doctrine of the reformation has been given up, or the principle abandoned on which it has always rested, we request him to review this position and to fortify it by evidence, or abandon it. Not one of the first principles of the doctrinal system of the reformers has been abandoned, while every one of them has been corroborated by a more accurate knowledge of mental philosophy, and of scriptural interpretation. The entire system never stood so impregnable as now, and never appeared so intelligible, so reasonable, so amiable, and at the same time, so terrible to guilty consciences as now. And if Dr. C. supposes that the doctrine of man's depravity, or the doctrine of election, is not preached as often as they were, and that Calvinists are holding their peace on these points, he follows his own imagination instead of historical verity.

All the great doctrines of the reformation are preached more frequently, and more plainly and powerfully by the orthodox in New-England, than they were fifty, or even thirty years ago ; and their faithful exhibition is attended by the power of God in those increasing revivals of religion which are carrying salvation through our land.

I have concluded therefore that the time has come which demands an examination of these claims. If Calvinists are becoming Unitarians in doctrine without the capacity to know it, or the magnanimity to own it, let it be known, and let them have their reward. And if Unitarian writers are setting up their claim falsely, from ignorance, or from an apprehension that the Calvinistic system presented to their people as Calvinists believe and teach it, would convict them of misrepresentation, and bring upon them the just indignation of an injured community, whose confidence they have abused, then let this be known, and let Unitarians have their reward.

I come then to the question, are the doctrines contained in the discourse, entitled "the faith once delivered to the saints," the same substantially with the doctrines held by the reformers, the puritans, the fathers of New-England, and which are now held by the great body of the orthodox in our country—or are they "decidedly anti-calvinistic," exhibiting substantially the system which has been embraced by Arminians and Unitarians ?

I claim that the epitome in the Sermon embodies substantially and represents fairly, all the elementary and fundamental principles of that system which have been denominated Calvinistic ; and the reviewer claims that they are an innovation upon the popular Calvinistic faith ; that they err and stray entirely from the Calvinistic system, and are decidedly anti-calvinistic.

My first remark is, that if the system of doctrines which I have set forth is decidedly anti-calvinistic or Unitarian, then the world hitherto has been very much disquieted in vain on the subject of doctrinal disagreement ; for if this creed of mine be Arminian or Unitarian, it is no less true, as I shall be able to

show, that it is substantially Calvinistic—so that the controversialists on both sides have walked hitherto in a vain show, and have so fought as men that beat the air.

2. If the epitome is decidedly anti-calvinistic and Unitarian, then Sir, the age of doctrinal controversy is ended, and the millennial agreement of the watchmen seeing eye to eye is begun. For I have evidence, which I will produce in its place, that the doctrines contained in the discourse are substantially Calvinistic, and are so regarded by the orthodox in this country, and by the reviewer himself. If then it is at the same time sufficiently happy in its terms to express the views of truth embraced by Arminians and Unitarians, their doctrinal controversy is ended, and the age of concord is begun.

At this auspicious moment let us look at the articles of pacification—at this Unitarian creed, the most explicit, if not the first which has ever been published in this country.

ARTICLE 1. Unitarians believe, That men are free agents; in the possession of such faculties, and placed in such circumstances, as to render it practicable for them to do whatever God requires; reasonable that he should require it; and fit that he should inflict, literally, the entire penalty of disobedience—such ability is here intended, as lays a perfect foundation for government by law, and for rewards and punishments according to deeds.

ART. 2. Unitarians believe, that the law of God requires love to God with all the heart, and impartial love for men; together with certain overt duties to God and men, by which this love is to be expressed; and that this law is supported by the sanctions of eternal life and eternal death.

ART. 3. Unitarians believe, that the ancestors of our race violated this law; that, in some way, as a consequence of their apostasy, all men, as soon as they become capable of accountable action, do, *of their own accord, most freely, and most wickedly*, withhold from God the *supreme love* and from man the *impartial love* which the law requires, beside violating many of its practical precepts; and that the obedience of the heart which the law requires,

has ceased entirely from the whole race of man.

ART. 4. Unitarians believe, that, according to the principles of moral government, obedience, either antecedent to transgression or subsequent, cannot avert the penalty of law; and that pardon, upon condition of repentance merely, would destroy the efficacy of moral government.

ART. 5. Unitarians believe, that an atonement has been made for sin by Jesus Christ; with reference to which God can maintain the influence of his law and forgive sin, upon condition of repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ:—that all men are invited sincerely, in this way to return to God, with an assurance of pardon and eternal life if they comply.

ART. 6. Unitarians believe, that a compliance with these conditions, is practicable, in the regular exercise of the powers and faculties given to man as an accountable creature; and is prevented only by the exercise of a voluntary, criminal aversion to God so inflexibly obstinate, that by motives merely, men are never persuaded to repent and believe.

ART. 7. Unitarians believe, that God is able, by his Spirit, to make to the mind of man such an exhibition of the truth, as shall unfailingly convince him of sin, render him willing to obey the gospel, and actually and joyfully obedient.

ART. 8. Unitarians believe, that this special influence of the Holy Spirit is given according to the supreme discretion, or good pleasure of God; and yet, ordinarily, is so inseparably associated with the use of means by the sinner, as to create ample encouragement to attend upon them, and to render all hopes of conversion while neglecting or rejecting the truth, or while living in open sin, eminently presumptuous.

ART. 9. Unitarians believe, that believers are justified by the merits of Christ through faith; and are received into a covenant with God, which secures their continuance in holiness for ever;—while those who die in their sins will continue to sin wilfully, and to be punished justly for ever.

ART. 10. Unitarians believe, that God exercises a providential government; which extends to all events in such a manner, as to lay a just foundation for resignation to him in afflictions brought upon us by the wickedness of men, and for gratitude in the reception of good in all the various modes of human instrumentality—that all events shall illustrate his glory and be made subservient to the good of his kingdom—and that this government is administered in accordance with a purpose or plan, known

and approved of by him from the beginning.

ART. 11. Unitarians believe, finally, that the God of the universe has revealed himself to us as existing in three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; possessing distinct and equal attributes, and in some unrevealed manner so united as to constitute *one God*.

This, then, is the creed, which the reviewer pronounces anti-calvinistic, and as embodying, of course, and setting forth the faith of Unitarians. If I could only be assured, that the reviewer understood the epitome, when he wrote; and understood the doctrinal opinions of Unitarians; and that he does '*ex animo*', believe what is stated in the creed contained in the sermon, I should give myself up to unmingled joy.

But I have known persons, and ministers too, and even orthodox ministers, who, having treasured up sounds, instead of ideas, could never recognise a doctrine as the same, if it was stated in any language, but that to which their ears had been accustomed.

It has been claimed also, if I mistake not, by Unitarians, that there are five or six hundred Unitarian ministers in the Church of Old England, who have declared that they do, without equivocation or mental reservation, believe in articles, which they do '*ex animo*' disbelieve and despise.

The reviewer also has told us, that Unitarian views of the Christian graces may be different from ours; and I see not why our views of Christian morality, may not differ from theirs as much;—theirs authorizing them to say and do things upon principles of expediency, which the orthodox might regard as inconsistent with simplicity and godly sincerity.

It has even been thought and said by some, that Unitarians have felt themselves at liberty to display more dexterity than honesty, in disposing of a troublesome argu-

ment; never taking it by the horns, when it might, peradventure, be seen to push them; and sometimes doing just nothing at all with it, upon the principle that some arguments are more easily forgotten than answered; and sometimes even claiming the argument to which resistance might have been hazardous. This last is the master stroke of policy. For what but discomfiture can an antagonist expect, when, if he reasons inconclusively, he is sure to be detected; and if he reasons conclusively, he is sure to be claimed as in unison with the enemy?

We are delivered, however, in the present case, from the apprehension of insincerity, or of artifice, on the part of the reviewer; since he brings against me publicly a charge, implicating my intellect or my honesty, in pretending that the creed which I have given is substantially Calvinistic;—a thing which neither his honour as a man, nor his conscience as a Christian, would allow him to do, if he did not '*ex animo*' believe that my creed is, as he declares it to be, decidedly anti-calvinistic, and of course, decidedly Arminian and Unitarian. Have then the Unitarians come over to the Calvinists; or have the Calvinists gone over to them? This is the question.

It is certainly an unexpected task which devolves upon me, of proving that my doctrinal opinions are Calvinistic. It is not my purpose to exhaust the subject now; but if after reading the evidence which I submit to his consideration, the reviewer shall remain skeptical and call for more, it shall be at his service.

As evidence then that the doctrinal system contained in the epitome is substantially Calvinistic, I submit the following:

1. It is the doctrinal system which I have exhibited in my public ministry for more than twenty years, and which has secured to me without contradiction until

now, the reputation of being a Calvinist. Could this have happened, if my system of belief were decidedly anti-calvinistic? Have Calvinists and Arminians misunderstood my doctrinal opinions, until now?

2. Since the publication of the Sermon, I have been neither admonished of heresy, nor denounced for it by any of my Calvinistic brethren; and commonly the orthodox are not slow to denounce apostates, especially in Connecticut, Unitarians themselves being judges.

3. I have received from Unitarians none of those tokens of complacency which they are wont to bestow upon apostates from orthodoxy. Not one of the thousand trumpets which blow the fame of favoured Unitarians, has swelled a note in my praise; and no Unitarian press has groaned with a second and third edition of this anti-calvinistic sermon, for gratuitous distribution.

4. Even the reviewer is not softened by his own convictions of my anti-calvinism into complacency and good feeling, but goes on throughout the review, smiting as if he were contending with a real antagonist. Could this have happened if he had only found a convert from Calvinism, whose only fault was that he had not as yet found out that he had come over to the Unitarian faith? Indeed, I have attempted in vain to discover how an anti-calvinistic creed, claiming to be the faith delivered to the saints, should be regarded as furnishing an occasion for proving that Calvinism is not the primitive faith. Had I anywhere asserted, that Calvinism is the primitive faith? I had not named the term. Was the evangelical system, however, so decidedly Calvinistic in its bearings, that it must fall of course to the ground, if it could be proved that Calvinism is not the faith delivered to the saints? By no means. The

doctrines laid down in the sermon, are an "innovation upon the popular faith" of Calvinists. They are "decidedly anti-calvinistic." They are the doctrinal articles of Arminians and Unitarians; and yet in reviewing this decidedly anti-calvinistic Unitarian creed, a great effort is made, to prove that Calvinism is not the faith delivered to the saints. Would not the reviewer have put forth his strength to as much purpose, if he had laboured to prove that Mahometanism was not the faith delivered to the saints?

5. I have made inquiry far and wide, for the purpose of ascertaining whether I had, in the opinion of the orthodox of any class, as I have in the opinion of the reviewer, "erred and strayed entirely" from the Calvinistic system. But while some differ with me on subordinate points, or modes of explanation, all without exception from whom I have heard, have admitted that the sermon contains *substantially* a true account of the faith delivered to the saints, and a *true account* of what have been denominated the doctrines of the reformation and of the orthodox faith as held in this country.

Dr. Green of Philadelphia, the Editor of the Christian Advocate, says, in a review of my sermon, that I belong to a class of ministers who are Calvinists; that the evangelical system will no doubt be considered as a Calvinistic statement; that I claim, and justly, all Calvinists of whatever description, as belonging to those who hold the evangelical system, though all of them would not of course subscribe to every statement it contains;—but no man understands more fully than Dr. Green does, the doctrinal articles of the Presbyterian confession of faith, and the prevailing views of the Presbyterian church.

The class of Calvinists to which Dr. Green supposes I belong are probably the Calvinists of Connecticut, and of New-England generally. But are not the orthodox clergy of

Connecticut and New-England, Calvinists? Are not the Professors at Andover Calvinistic? and yet no complaint from that source has been made against the sermon as anti-calvinistic; on the contrary, it has been recognised by the Professors as being what it claims to be, substantially Calvinistic.

But I have in reserve an authority to which the reviewer will, I have no doubt, do ample justice. It is his own opinion, and is as follows:

"We doubt not that Dr. B. is fully persuaded in his own mind that the true import of Scripture favours *his* system, but not more so than we are, that it favours *ours*."

Ah! Dr. B.'s system and our system; and Dr. B. supporting his system by one interpretation of the Bible, and the reviewer by another and a different interpretation? Dr. B.'s system is not the same then with that adopted by the reviewer and his Unitarian brethren. They and Dr. B., according to the reviewer, *differ*, and differ too on points where no difference is possible but that of opposition. The Unitarian system is confessedly anti-calvinistic; and Dr. B. differs from this system, and of course is Calvinistic: and yet a little while ago, Dr. B.'s system was 'decidedly anti-calvinistic,' an 'innovation upon the popular faith,' 'erring and straying entirely' from the Calvinistic system.

It is hoped that the reviewer will be able to reconcile these seeming contrarieties of his own declarations; or if he should be unable to do this, that he will tell us which of the two declarations—that the evangelical system is Calvinistic, or that it is anti-calvinistic,—contains his real opinion; and that the public in the mean time will suspend their judgment until the reviewer shall have had an opportunity to shed light upon the subject.

I shall now proceed to submit to your consideration some further evidence, a little more direct, that the

doctrines laid down in the sermon are substantially Calvinistic, and no innovation upon the popular faith.

And here it would seem desirable to have a definition of Calvinism. But I find none in the reviewer, and I have not been able to find one in any Unitarian writer; and I cannot but think it a hardship that one of the parties in a dispute should be required to make the definitions on both sides,—giving to the enemy a tangible object of assault from his moveable and undefined battery. Critics however inform us, that the import of undefined terms may be ascertained by their incidental use; and blessed with no other light, I have endeavoured to ascertain what the reviewer understands by Calvinism. I perceive then, that the topics from which he infers my anti-calvinism, are the doctrines of free-agency, of original sin, total depravity, the atonement, and the use of means. Now as what I have advanced on these subjects is declared to be anti-calvinism,—Calvinism must be just the opposite of what I have laid down. But what have I taught? That man is a free agent, in the possession of such powers as lays a foundation for moral government;—that original sin is not a physical property of the soul, but voluntary and accountable;—that pardon cannot be granted upon repentance merely, and that an atonement has been made for sin, to reconcile pardon with law;—that God renews the heart by the instrumentality of truth, and that there is great encouragement for sinners to use the means of grace, and great presumption in the neglect of them. What the reviewer quotes from the sermon on these subjects, is enough, he says, to show that according to Dr. Beecher, the faith delivered to the saints is decidedly anti-calvinistic.

The anti-calvinism of the primitive church is proved by quotations from the fathers which show that in their opinion, things do not come to

pass according to a necessity of fate ; that mankind are free agents and accountable for their deeds, and are liable to rewards and punishments according to the worth of the actions of every one ; that not a single one is formed wicked by the Creator of all things ; that the atonement is made for all men, and not for a part merely, and that those to whom the gospel is preached perish through their own fault, and not from the limitation of the atonement, or by any physical inability or fatal necessity. These positions then, from my discourse and from the fathers, being in the opinion of the reviewer enough to prove that both my opinions and theirs are decidedly anti-calvinistic—Calvinism as being the opposite of these must be supposed to teach that things happen according to fate ; that mankind are not free agents, in the possession of any such ability as lays a perfect foundation for government by law, and that there are no moral qualities in actions, and that mankind are not to be rewarded or punished according to their deeds ; that God creates in man a sinful nature ; that pardon upon condition of repentance merely, is consistent with moral government ; that no atonement is necessary or has been made ; that God renews the hearts of men without the instrumentality of truth, and that sinners have no encouragement to use the means of grace ; that men do not fail of salvation by their own fault, but by the limitation of the atonement, or a physical inability to obey the gospel.

But are these the doctrinal opinions of Calvinists ? Do they believe and teach the doctrine of fate and deny the doctrine of man's free agency, and of rewards and punishments in a future state according to the deeds done in the body ; that God creates in man a sinful nature ; that pardon is consistent with law upon condition of repentance merely ; that God renews the heart without the instrumentality of the truth ; that there is no encouragement for

sinners to use the means of grace ; and that men fail of salvation by a fatal necessity, and not by their own fault ? These points are Calvinism, or the reviewer's arguments to prove me and the fathers anti-calvinistic are nothing to the purpose. But does he believe that Calvinists hold to such doctrines ? I hope the reviewer will not regard me as treating him with indecorum if I say, that "he knows" that the doctrines last named are not Calvinism, "or his ignorance upon the subject is such as to make it a sin for him to write upon it in so confident a manner."

We know that Calvinism is often represented as teaching that infants deserve damnation, and that hell is paved with their bones ; that all men are, by nature and necessarily, as depraved and wicked as they can be ; that an atonement has been made only for the sins of the elect—a very small part of mankind ; that the elect will be saved though they should conduct ever so wickedly, and that the non-elect cannot be saved, though they should conduct ever so religiously ; and that men to whom pardon is offered, without special grace to enable them to repent, are in the condition of captives in a dungeon,—insulted with the offer of liberty, and threatened if they do not embrace it, when their hands are bound, and their feet put in fetters.

Who circulate these fabrications is no secret. A minister in Boston inquired lately of a person, what he thought of that horrible doctrine of Calvinism, that hell was paved with the bones of infants ; and a youth educated under Unitarian auspices, who heard and approved an orthodox account of original sin and man's depravity, expressed his disappointment, and said that he had supposed that the preachers agreed with the Professors at Andover, that infants were sent to hell.

It is needless to say, that the views of Calvinism implied in the arguments of the reviewer and in the statements just alluded to, are false.

How long the good people of Massachusetts will be doomed to be terrified by their spiritual guides, with these stories about Calvinism, as children are terrified by superstitious nurses with stories of ghosts and hobgoblins, I cannot tell. It will not avail the reviewer, to say that one or another of these odious positions has been adopted by persons who were Calvinists. Calvinism is not found in the eccentricities of men who bear that name; for then there would be as many Calvinisms as there are specific differences of opinion among Calvinists. Calvinism is that system of doctrine, which in its great elementary principles, is opposed to what is called the Arminian system. The two systems, as all systems built on revelation must do, include some truths in common; but there are certain points on which they not only differ, but hold opposite doctrines. It is those doctrines in which Calvinists and Arminians differ, which constitute the two opposing systems; and it is those doctrines in their elementary positions as held by all Calvinists which constitute Calvinism, and not those circumstantial varieties in which they differ. Is Dr. Priestly's doctrine Unitarianism; and may we charge the Unitarians of Boston publicly with holding all that Priestly taught? Are the doctrines of Mr. Belsham Unitarianism; and may we innocently tell our people, in our publications and from the pulpit, that the Unitarians of Massachusetts hold to all the doctrines which are found in the writings of Belsham? Why then is the impression made upon honest and fair-minded Unitarian people, that Calvinism is, in many abominable particulars, what Unitarians of information know that it is not, as held and taught by the great body of Calvinists throughout New-England, and throughout our country? Are the teachers of Unitarian doctrine afraid to have Calvinism, as it is believed and taught in the orthodox congre-

gations, come before their people attended by its appropriate evidence? Do they fear that their people would say to their ministers, —if this is Calvinism, you have misrepresented Calvinists and abused us? Do they fear that the arguments which support Calvinism, divested of misrepresentation, would be too mighty to be encountered? Do they place their hopes of maintaining their ascendancy, where it exists, in keeping their people ignorant of Calvinism as it is believed by the orthodox? Do they rely more on misrepresentation and the popular odium which they excite against our doctrine, than on fair statements and sound arguments?

It will not avail the reviewer to say that his views of Calvinism are fairly implied in the principles of the system. For Calvinism is what Calvinists *believe*, and not what they disbelieve. It is what they mean by what they say, and not what they expressly reject and disavow. To represent opinions, therefore, as being Calvinism, which Calvinists as a body disavow, is a gross misrepresentation.

But let us attend a little more minutely to the reviewer's evidence of the anti-calvinism of my creed. The first is found in my asserting the ability and free agency of man, such as qualifies him for government by law and renders him a fit subject of reward or punishment. Did any Calvinist ever deny such ability and free agency in man as lays a proper foundation for moral government? Was there ever a Calvinist that did not hold to the entire depravity of man, to the justice of God in his condemnation, and to his boundless grace in providing a Saviour, and renovating the heart by his Holy Spirit; and do Calvinists hold to all this and yet dare deny such ability and free agency to man as lays a proper foundation for government by law, and for rewards and punishments?

The doctrine of man's free agen-

cy is contained in the fact that man is a free agent—a proper subject of moral government, and of reward and punishment according to his deeds, in such a sense as creates obligation to obey the gospel, and renders the condemnation and punishment of unbelief just. But the philosophy of mind—the metaphysical account of the grounds of free agency, is not *Calvinism*; for on this subject Calvinists differ;—some placing his free agency in his *created powers* which the fall has not obliterated; others in the adventitious aids of the Holy Spirit, and some perhaps, giving no philosophical account at all of the matter.

But none of these theories in respect to the ground of man's free agency are Calvinism; and those of course are not anti-calvinists, that is, they do not *oppose* the fundamental principles of Calvinism on the subject of free agency, who believe that man is *endued by his Creator with such powers as qualify him to render that obedience to the gospel which he voluntarily and wickedly withholds*. Are not the great body of the clergy in New-England Calvinists? Have they not been so reputed and so called by Unitarians, and does not the reviewer know that while they hold with the reformers and puritans, that man is a free agent, they hold also that his free agency is constituted by the possession of powers and faculties which furnish ability and create obligation to obey the gospel? The article on the subject of free agency is not *anti-calvinistic*: it is the view of the subject which has prevailed extensively in New-England and among those who have been considered the most high-toned Calvinists, long before the reviewer or the writer of the sermon was born.

“On the subject of *original sin* and *native depravity*, our author,” the reviewer says, “is hardly less sound in his orthodoxy. He does indeed say that the ‘*supreme love*’ to God and the ‘*impartial love*’ to man

which the law requires, have ceased entirely from *the earth*”—from the whole race of man. “By this, however, he cannot mean, that all *real* ‘obedience of the heart,’ ‘of every kind and degree, has ceased entirely from the whole race of man,’ because he must believe that *some degree* at least of this obedience is still to be found in real Christians. All therefore that he can intend, and all that his language necessarily signifies is, that in our fallen state, our love to God has ceased to be absolutely *supreme*, and our love to man strictly *impartial*; that is, that our obedience is *imperfect*;—not, we should think, a very bold position, nor one likely to be contested by any man in his right mind.”

I have always understood the Bible to say that where there is not supreme love to God in the heart, there is none at all; and that the love to man which is not in its nature benevolent and impartial, is sinister and selfish. If I am correct, then, in my understanding of the Bible, the declaration that the supreme love to God and the impartial love to man which the law requires, have ceased entirely from the whole race of man, would seem to imply something more than that “our obedience is imperfect,” especially if the clause be added which the reviewer has omitted, ‘that the obedience of the heart which the law requires has ceased entirely from the whole race of man.’ But I “cannot mean that all real obedience of the heart of every kind and degree has ceased from the whole race of man.” Be it so: but have I not said it? for the question is not whether I believe what I have said,—but what I have said. Does not my language then teach, that all obedience which the law of God requires has ceased *entirely* from the whole race of man,—and why may I not be supposed to mean as I have said? Because I must believe that ‘real Christians’ have in their hearts some degree of obedience to the law of God; that is, I cannot

believe that all men refuse to obey the law as soon as they begin to act accountably, because I believe that some men are afterwards made willing to obey it, in some degree, by the special influence of the Holy Spirit. The reviewer might as well insist that I cannot believe that all men are born infants, because they become men afterwards; or that infants are born without innate ideas, because I must admit that they have ideas sometime after they are born.

The statement which I have given of the doctrine of the *atonement*, might, the reviewer says, be adopted by all Unitarians of whom we have any knowledge. But does not the reviewer know that the turning point of the controversy between Calvinists and Unitarians, is the necessity of an atonement, arising from the nature of moral government which renders it impossible, as free agents are constituted, to forgive sin upon condition of repentance merely, and yet maintain the influence of law? Does he not perceive that this point is prominently stated in the Sermon, and does he not know that this principle is unequivocally and almost universally denied by Unitarians at the present day?—Is he not acquainted with the recent productions of Dr. Ware? But Dr. Ware says expressly that “the sufferings of Christ were the means of delivering us from punishment, *only* as they are instrumental in delivering us from the dominion of sin, *only* as they are the means of bringing us to repentance, *only* as they operate in bringing us to that state of holiness which has the promise of forgiveness and qualifies for it.”*

Is he not acquainted with the opinions of Dr. Bancroft? But Dr. Bancroft says that the doctrine of the atonement represents God as an inexorable being, and introduces a principle in his administration, which would disgrace any government on earth.† Is he unacquainted

with the posthumous sermons of the Rev. Mr. Buckminster? But he says “there is nothing in scripture which represents that Christ has made it just for God to forgive sins now upon condition of repentance, when it would not have been before.”‡ Has he no acquaintance with the Christian Disciple, and its patrons? But in that work we are taught, that God’s justice presents no obstacles in the way of his freely pardoning all such as repent and reform, without his requiring any satisfaction for the sins they may have previously committed.¶ Is he unacquainted with the Unitarian Miscellany, and its Editor? But it is asserted in that work, that God may pardon the sins of his creatures upon any terms which he may think proper without exacting satisfaction to his justice.

All these passages deny the existence of any such legal difficulty in the way of pardon, as is expressed in my statement of the doctrine of the atonement; and claim that Jesus Christ has done nothing to render pardon upon condition of repentance, consistent with efficacious legislation; and assert that the entire influence of all which he has done is confined to instruction and example and motive, as these may operate naturally upon the mind of man.

Now if the Reviewer was unacquainted with the sentiments of the above named writers, on the subject of the atonement, why did he hazard the assertion that they might very well adopt what I have said on this subject? But if he was acquainted with the above quoted opinions, how can he justify himself in saying, that men might very well adopt sentiments which he knew them most expressly to disavow? It is no uncommon thing to meet with Unitarian writers who are unacquainted with Calvinism, but never before has it been my lot to meet with a Unitarian writer who was

* Letter to Trin. p. 93.

† Ser. p. 224.

‡ Ser. p. 249.

¶ Ch. Dis. 1823, p. 191.

alike ignorant on both sides of the question, and who misrepresented both Unitarians and Calvinists.

There is one subject more to which my attention is called by the reviewer with a note of earnestness which must not be disregarded. It is my representing the Liberal system as *opposite* to the Evangelical. 'Let him refer,' he says, 'to the passages in which Professor Ware or Dr. Channing has asserted or implied that men are not free agents; or that atonement has not been made for sin by Jesus Christ;* or that a compliance with the conditions of the gospel is not 'practicable in the regular exercise of the powers and faculties given to man as an accountable creature;' or that God does not exercise 'a providential government which extends to all events.' Let him do this, or retract his charge as publicly as it has been made, or consent to lie under the imputation of a shameless calumny.'

I am happy to be called to an account by the reviewer, if I have misrepresented Unitarians; and also to agree with him that if I have done it and do not retract the misrepresentation as publicly as I have made it, I do lie justly under the imputation of a shameless calumny. But in speaking of the doctrines of the Evangelical and Liberal systems as oppo-

* See the extracts just before quoted, and our references at the bottom of the page.

site, I had reference to those which constitute and characterize the two systems as opposite, and not to those truths which must of course be held in common in all creeds founded upon revelation. Have not the Calvinistic and Arminian systems always been called opposite systems, and yet did any man ever intend by this, that they held no truths in common? And when I say 'the question is not how much of this system may be misunderstood consistently with sanctification by that which is still embraced; but can it be rejected entirely by those who possess the Bible, and those who do it be sanctified without it,—my object is to wave the question concerning those who embrace some more and some less of the evangelical system, and to press the inquiry whether all the articles which constitute the Evangelical and the Liberal systems, opposite systems, can be rejected, and those who do this be saved by the truths which they hold in common with Calvinists?

And now, Sir, I cannot perceive any horns for me to hang upon in the dilemma which the reviewer has presented. There is no misrepresentation. The Calvinistic and Unitarian systems are opposite systems, though they agree in some points. Of course there is no occasion for a public retraction, and no ground for the imputation of 'shameless calumny.'

[To be continued.]

LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE.

THE translation of Storr's Biblical Theology by the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, is we understand nearly completed, and will be published, in two volumes, in the course of a few months.

Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, is in a course of translation at Andover, and will appear in a few days. This work, which treats of the peculiarities of the Greek of the New Testament, will be a valuable acquisition to the student in Biblical learning.

Proposals have been issued in Boston for publishing a collection of American Poetry, under the title of *Anthologia Americana*, or Selections from the works of American Poets, in three or four volumes, 8vo.

A volume of Letters and Papers of the late Dr. Scott, with occasional observations by the Rev. John Scott, is in press, at New-York.

The Rev. Willard Preston of Burlington, Vt. has been elected President of the College at that place, and George W. Benedict, A. M. of Newburgh, N. Y. elected Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.

A gentleman in this city has received the first eight numbers of the *Bulletin Universel des Sciences et de L'Industrie*; each number consisting of nearly six hundred closely printed octavo pages. It is designed to exhibit the efforts of the human mind, in all parts of Europe and America, on subjects of science and the arts; giving notices and reviews of all books and memoirs on these subjects. Each number is divided into eight sections, which treat, 1st. of Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and Chemistry; 2d. Geology, Mineralogy, Botany, and Zoology; 3d. Anatomy, Physiology, Medicine, Surgery, and Pharmacy; 4th. Agriculture, Rural and Domestic Economy; 5th. Chemic and Mechanic Arts; 6th. Geography, Topography, Statistics, Public Economy, Voyages, &c.; 7th. Philology, Etymology, Archæology, Mythology, History, &c.; 8th. Military Sciences. Each section is under the care of a particular editor, while M. De Ferussac, has the general superintendence of the whole. The authors of the several articles are mentioned, and we notice many of the first names among the French Mathematicians, Philosophers, and Literati. The sections are so printed and paged that they may be bound separately in seventeen volumes. The price of the whole work is 181 francs a year. That of the separate sections is from 15 to 30 francs. **

The Governor of New-York, in his Message to the Legislature, mentions that the number of children taught in the common schools of that State during the last year exceeds 400,000, and is probably more than one fourth of its whole population. Ten thousand three hundred and eighty-three have been instructed in the free and charity schools in the city of New-York, a number by no means proportioned to the wants of its population. The students in the incorporated academies amount to about 2683, and in the colleges to 755. The fund for the common schools may be stated at upwards of 1,739,000 dollars, and its annual income at 98,000 dollars, to which may be added the interest on the future sales of lands, and on the

disposal of escheated property, the proceeds of which latter item may be added to the capital.

Although this fund may appear large, the governor recommends that it be augmented. "The state is capable of supporting fourteen millions of inhabitants. This appropriation will therefore soon be found far behind the progress of population and the requisitions for instruction."—But while primary schools cannot be too numerous, he thinks that colleges ought to be few in number, and well endowed.

On the 14th of November there was seen at Munich, between noon and one o'clock, a very curious phenomenon. The Alps, covered with snow, appeared to approach nearer to Munich, and presented an imposing curtain, many parts of which were completely enlightened. The valleys and the projections appeared to be distinguishable, but the summits appeared as if on fire. Long rays of flame appeared to rise above them, and to disappear in the air. Professor Gruithugsen thought that he perceived through his telescope, that these appearances were owing to an impetuous wind, which raised the snow of the Alps to a height of 3000 feet.—Perhaps others, in reflecting on the facts, will find other causes for them.

M. Fresnel presented to the Academy of Sciences in Paris, at their session in May last, the model of a *lamp for a lighthouse*, which has since been put to the test of experiment, and found to succeed perfectly. The lamp has two concentric wicks, and is calculated to burn less than half a pound of oil in an hour, and it gives a light which is equal to that of *forty-eight* lamps of Carcel, and may be seen at the distance of six leagues. This effect is produced by surrounding it with demi-cylindrical lenses placed horizontally, which refract the light so as to give it a direction parallel to the horizon. By means of cylindrical lenses, and mirrors placed obliquely over and under the lamp, most of the light which issues from it is thus thrown into a horizontal direction. A lamp of four times the size above mentioned, and burning a pound and a half of oil in an hour, would give a light equal to *three hundred* lamps of Carcel, and by using *Oil Gas*, it is confidently expected that the light will equal in intensity *four hundred* such lamps. Such

is the peculiar appearance of this lamp, in consequence of the refraction of the light, that it can be readily distinguished from any other light in the neighbourhood. A lamp of the largest kind would present the appearance of a bar of fire nearly six feet in height.—(Bulletin Universel, August, 1824.) **

The attention of our countryman, Perkins, seems now to be principally directed to the application of the force of steam, to the throwing of projectiles, and especially to the discharge of cannon balls. He proposes to throw balls of any size, even of many hundred pounds weight. This project will not appear extravagant, when it is known that steam, at the temperature of 1200 Farenheit, exerts an expansive force of more than 50,000 pounds to the square inch, and that the force of gunpowder, by which a cannon is discharged, is no more than 600 pounds to the square inch. In addition to the immense power of these new machines, their great recommendation is the saving of expense; the formation of steam requiring only the expense of fuel, which is trifling in comparison with powder. Perhaps a greater excellence in the eyes of a Christian observer is, that should they be put in practice and succeed, they would probably tend in no small degree to prevent wars, especially wars of aggression and conquest. It is a remark which has been frequently made, and its justness generally admitted, that wars, contrary to what was anticipated, have been less bloody since the invention of gunpowder and the use of fire-arms, than before; and the reason is evident: the certainty of death, or at least the improbability of escaping or resisting the instruments of death, prevent that pride of personal strength and prowess, by which the heroes of antiquity chased with exultation a host before them. There is less of resentment and vengeance in the individual combatants; there is also much justness in the remarks of Dupin.* "When gunpowder was first applied to combat, the friends of humanity were alarmed with the idea that we had acquired a means of destruction so powerful; but effects

altogether opposite have dissipated for ever these chimerical fears. When destruction comes, slowly and gradually, and mingled with some successes, the disasters of yesterday are forgotten in the present triumph; and as there is no great catastrophe, neither of the parties is struck with the propriety of demanding peace." It will be a great excellence of these engines, in the eyes of every lover of freedom and of the independence of nations, that they can obviously be used with a peculiar advantage in fortifications, and generally in defensive warfare. We add, that the reason why Mr. Perkins has not made experiments on a larger scale, is stated to be, that he is waiting to obtain a patent for his inventions. **

It was stated in the public papers, in the beginning of the last year, that Sir H. Davy, proposed to *preserve the copper sheathing of vessels* from the corroding action of sea water, by attaching to it a piece of zinc, or soft iron. By this means, on the principle of the Voltaic apparatus, the copper would be permanently in an electro-negative state, which would prevent the chemical action of the sea-water upon it. Some experiments made upon vessels lying in still water, were stated to be unfavourable. Sir Humphrey returned in August or September from a voyage to Norway, where he was engaged during the months of July and August, in pursuing various philosophical researches, for which the admiralty granted him the use of the *Comet* steamboat. "He has ascertained that his principle of protecting the copper sheathing of ships by the contact of $\frac{1}{10}$ of iron, is perfectly successful, even in the most rapid sailing, and in the roughest sea." **

The Board of Longitude have conferred on Mr. Barlow, professor in the Military Academy, Woolwich, England, the premium of 500 pounds sterling, for his discovery of the means of preventing the local action of a ship on the magnetic needle. It consists in placing a plate of iron 12 or 16 inches in diameter, near the compass, so as to neutralize and destroy the magnetic action of the iron of the ship. **

* Boston Journal of Philosophy and the Arts, September 1824.

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Sermon on the duty and advantages of affording Instruction to the Deaf and Dumb. By Thomas H. Galaudet, Principal of the American Asylum at Hartford, Conn. for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb. Concord.

The intellectual and moral glories of the Christian Temple, illustrated from the history of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; a Synodical Discourse. By the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, A. M. Preached October 17th, in the Lutheran Church, Middletown, Md. and published by the Vestry of said Church.

Biblical Repertory, a Collection of Tracts in Biblical Literature. By Charles Hodge. Vol. I. No. 1. pp. 151. 8vo.

The Misrepresentations of Anna Braithwait, in relation to the Doctrines preached by Elias Hicks, together with the Refutation of the same, in a Letter from Elias Hicks to Dr. Atlee of Philadelphia.

A Letter on the Dispute of the Statements of Anna Braithwait and Elias Hicks, said to have been written by Ann Shipley. Reprinted from the New

York edition, with a review of the same. Philadelphia.

Calumny Refuted; or Plain Facts versus Misrepresentation, being a Reply to a pamphlet, entitled, 'The Misrepresentations of Anna Braithwait, in relation to the doctrines preached by Elias Hicks,' &c. Philadelphia. October, 1824.

Love to the Church the highest distinction; a Sermon, preached before the First Church in North-Yarmouth, Maine, July 25th, 1824, preceding an election to the office of Deacon. By Asa Cummings.

A Discourse delivered at Hartford, Conn. September 15, 1824, at the fifteenth annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. By Samuel Austin, D. D. Boston.

Remarks on the Modern Doctrines of the Universalists.

A Sermon delivered at Bangor, Me. June 21, 1824, before the Maine Missionary Society, at their Seventeenth Anniversary. By Allen Greely, pastor of the church in Turner.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE Missionary Herald for January, contains a list of three Auxiliary Societies, and upwards of sixty Gentlemen's and Ladies' Associations, recently formed in aid of the American Board, in pursuance of the plan lately adopted by that body for the regular supply of its Treasury.

The Board solicit donations of printing paper, for the presses at Bombay and the Sandwich Islands; writing paper and other stationary articles for the missions and mission schools especially at the Sandwich Islands; also, shoes, blankets, domestic cloths, &c. principally for the Indian missions.

The number of Schools in the connexion of the American Sunday School Union, is 723: the number of Teachers, 7,300; the number of Scholars, 49,613.

The Connecticut Branch of the American Tract Society, as appears

from their ninth report just published, have issued from their Depository during the past year, 14,616 tracts—and since the formation of the Society, 320,203.

We learn that there is a revival of religion in Hamilton College, N. Y. A letter, dated Jan. 11, states that eighteen of the students had become the subjects of it. It had extended to the neighbouring village of Clinton.

The Friends in North Carolina, at their late annual meeting passed a resolution to send all the people of colour under their care, amounting to about seven hundred, to the Island of Hayti: and an order was granted to raise funds immediately for their transportation. It is generally known that the principles of the Society of Friends do not permit its members to hold slaves.

DONATIONS TO RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

(In the month of December.)

To the American Bible Society, \$3,590 76. Issued from the Depository, Bibles and Testaments, 5,713; valued at \$3,194.43.

To the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, \$3,828.20, exclusive of legacies, articles of clothing, &c.

To the American Education Society, \$219.41.

To the United Foreign Missionary Society, \$1127.94.

ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATIONS.

OCT. 16.—The Rev. LOYAL FAIRMAN, of the Baptist Church at White-water, Ohio, to the work of the Ministry.

OCT. 27.—The Rev. ISAAC FERRIS, (installed) Pastor of the second Reformed Dutch Church of Albany, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Jacob Van Vechtea, of Schenectady.

NOV. 2.—The Rev. SERENO TAYLOR, at Saxon's Village, Vt. Sermon by the Rev. Phinehas Cooke, of Ackworth.

DEC. 28.—The Rev. JAMES B. HARDERBERGH, Pastor of the United Dutch Churches of Helderbergh and Princetown. Sermon by the Rev. Gilbert R. Livingston, of Coxsackie.

DEC. 29.—The Rev. JOSEPH M. BREWSTER, Pastor of the Church in

Peru, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Pomroy, of Washington.

DEC. 30.—The Rev. JOHN H. PRENTICE, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in West Hartwick, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Aaron Putnam, of Springfield.

JAN. 12.—The Rev. WILLIAM H. FURNESS, Pastor of the First Congregational Unitarian Church in Philadelphia. Sermon by the Rev. Henry Ware, of Boston.

— The Rev. PAUL T. KEITH, was admitted to the order of Deacons, by the Rt. Rev. Bp. Bowen of the Diocese of South Carolina. Sermon by the Rev. Edward Rutledge.

— Rev. ALEXANDER YOUNG, Pastor of the New South Society in Boston. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Palfrey.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

AMONG our communications received during the month are several *anonymous* Sermons. The authors of these are entitled to our thanks, but they must excuse us if we do not think it proper to depart from a rule respecting anonymous Sermons and Reviews, which has been adhered to from the commencement of our work.

It has become necessary to correct an impression which has gone abroad to a considerable extent, that the Christian Spectator has changed its Editor. Under this impression several of our correspondents have addressed their communications to a gentleman who has never had any connexion with this publication.

* * We regret the necessity of again omitting our usual notice of Public Affairs. We had prepared an extended view for this department, but are compelled to postpone it, on account of the unexpected length of a preceding article.

ERRATUM.—January Number, p. 56, at top. for the Rev. ADOLPHUS TERRY, at West Hartland, Mass.—read, the Rev. *Adolphus Ferry*, at West Hartland, Conn.